PRETRIAL DECISION-MAKING IN IOWA: POLK AND LINN COUNTIES

VOLUME I

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
DIVISION OF MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING
BUREAU OF CORRECTIONAL EVALUATION

June, 1977

PRETRIAL DECISION-MAKING IN IOWA: COMPARISONS OF PRETRIAL PROGRAMS IN POLK COUNTY (FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT) AND LINN COUNTY (SIXTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT)[1]

VOLUME I

By James Boudouris, Richard Thomasgard, and Teresa Lacsina[2]

June, 1977

[1]This study was funded in part by grant #706-76-00-0470-43-07 from the U.S. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to The State Planning Agency of the Iowa Crime Commission. Readers are invited to forward inquiries to the Bureau Chief, Iowa Bureau of Correctional Evaluation, 507 10th Street, Des Moines, Iowa 50309, (Area Code 515) 281-4191

[2]Dr. Boudouris is Bureau Chief, Mr. Thomasgard is a former BCE Statistical Research Analyst I, and Ms. Lacsina is a Statistical Research Analyst II.

STATE OF IOWA

Robert D. Ray
Governor

Arthur A. Neu
Lieutenant Governor

Kevin J. Burns
Commissioner, Department of Social Services

Charles Sweeney
Director, Division of Management and Planning

Dr. James Boudouris
Chief, Bureau of Correctional Evaluation

HIGHLIGHTS

This is the first of a series of empirical studies of pretrial programs in Iowa. Quantitative data and statistical techniques were utilized in order to better understand the utility and validity of the pretrial release point system (ROR or release on recognizance point system) which was introduced in 1961 in New York City and adopted in Iowa in 1964.

In order to serve the needs of diverse audiences, two versions of this report have been prepared. Volume I is directed to program administrators and correctional staffs and summarizes the methodology and main findings of the study. Volume II is intended for analysts and researchers and includes more detailed tabulations that deal with alternative sources of data and their validity. Volume II enables the reader to compare data submitted on the bureau data forms with data obtained independently from the arrest records or rapsheets. Both versions present the same basic findings, and the concluding chapter (Chapter X) is the same. The reader may find it helpful to read Chapter X at the outset in order to gain an overview of the study.

The detailed analysis focuses on pretrial release (PTR), bail, and nonproject-ROR releasees, but some information is included on persons in jail, residential facilities, and other pretrial conditions. Future studies will include more detailed analysis of the persons released with supervision (RWS).

Data is presented on males arrested for felonies and interviewed by pretrial programs in Des Moines (Polk County, Fifth Judicial District) and Cedar Rapids (Linn County, Sixth Judicial District) during January, 1974

through June, 1975. This represents 1,520 men who were arrested for 1,756 offenses in Polk County, and 157 men who were charged with 175 offenses in Linn County.

The pretrial programs are described in terms of the characteristics of the arrestees and their relationships to the ROR points awarded and their failure/success rates. "Failure rates" were defined by whether a person was rearrested during the pretrial period and/or failed to appear in court. Regression analysis and discriminant analysis were used to analyze the data.

Chapter I includes a description of the pretrial programs in Polk and Linn Counties, and Chapter II discusses the methodology of the study. Chapter III presents data comparing the length of time between the initial arrest and the date of adjudication for the various pretrial components in Polk and Linn Counties. When controlling for the length of the pretrial period it was found that the Polk-PTR sample had a failure rate of 6% during the first three months compared to a failure rate of 15% among the Polk-bailees, while the rate for Linn-PTR was 7% compared to 22% for the Linn-bailees.

Rearrests were calculated for the one-year follow-up period after the date of adjudication and while the PTR samples show about the same rearrest rates in Polk and Linn Counties (16-17%), the bailees in Polk County were much more likely to be rearrested during this time than those in Linn County (39% compared to 16%). Statistically significant correlations were found to exist between the likelihood of being rearrested during the pretrial period and the likelihood of rearrest during a one-year follow-up period after the initial adjudication.

Chapter IV discusses the types of offenses for which persons were arrested or rearrested. The individual characteristics of the arrestees in these samples are tabulated in Chapter V, and Chapter VI correlates these

characteristics with ROR points. Chapter VII presents failure rates that are correlated with client characteristics.

Chapter VIII and IX utilize regression equations and discriminant analysis to arrive at a definition of "risk levels" that can be compared with and be used to modify the traditional ROR point system.

Chapter X is a summary of the findings of this report. Some suggestions are made as to the implications and possible uses of this analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)

LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)

LIST OF TABLES (CONT.)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS

Introduction

The pretrial program was introduced in Des Moines (Polk County), in 1964 and was modelled after the pioneering Vera-Manhattan Bail Project in the use of a point system to make recommendations to the court as to a defendant's pretrial status.

A variety of objectives of the pretrial programs have been presented by various authors and pretrial administrators (summarized in Mahoney, 1975.) A stated goal of the pretrial program in Des Moines is "to 'equalize' the pretrial stage so that those defendants arrested who are unable financially to post a bond can be released prior to their trial."

Other objectives that have been given are to enable the releasees to take an active part in their defense, and consequently, they will be less likely to be convicted; the releasees are more likely to receive lesser sentences (other than incarceration); if sentenced to incarceration, they will be given shorter sentences than those defendants who were detained in jail prior to their adjudication; those released will be less likely to be rearrested in the future, than those defendants who were detained in jail, and pretrial release will prevent unnecessary hardship to defendants and their families. These assumptions, (or hypotheses), have been discussed in the NCCD reports.[1]

In the present study the emphasis is on analysing the use of the point system in making recommendations to the court, but not all possible pretrial statuses will be compared. These subcategories will be described below.

---

[1]See bibliography

The study originated with an idea by Mr. Thomasgard and in response to an interest expressed by pretrial programs in Iowa for an evaluation of the point system and its effectiveness in channeling persons into the various pretrial programs. "Effectiveness" or "success/failure" are measured in this report by rearrests during the period between the date of initial arrest and the date of adjudication, and/or failure to appear in court on the scheduled date. Implicit in the use of such success criteria are the assumptions that pretrial programs are able to identify which persons are least likely to be rearrested prior to their date of adjudication and which persons can be relied upon to appear in court on scheduled date(s).

Description of Pretrial Programs in Polk and Linn Counties

Before presenting statistical data comparing the two pretrial programs in Des Moines (Polk County, Fifth Judicial District) and Cedar Rapids (Linn County, Sixth Judicial District) a description of their similarities and differences may be useful.[1]

The pretrial program in Polk County operates twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, during the summer months, and from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight during the remainder of the year. In Linn County, the hours of operation are 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. weekdays, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends.

---

[1]This description applies to the programs as of the period of the study, January, 1974 through June, 1975, and some changes may have occurred since then.

The Polk County pretrial release office is located in the same building as the Des Moines City Jail, where individuals arrested by the city police are booked and initially detained. Also in this building is the District Associate Court where arraignments are conducted. Individuals arrested by the Polk County Sheriff are booked at the Polk County Jail and have the opportunity to be interviewed by the pretrial release program when they are brought to District Associate Court for arraignment. Pretrial release interviewers also travel to the county jail to conduct interviews.

The pretrial release office for Linn County is located in the County Courthouse, adjacent to the Linn County Jail. All individuals arrested by the Cedar Rapids police and the Linn County Sheriff are booked at the county jail, and pretrial release interviews are conducted there.

The pretrial program staff in Polk County include five part-time interviewers and a Release with Supervision (RWS) Selection Unit. The RWS Selection Unit consists of the pretrial release supervisor and a counselor. In addition to the RWS Selection Unit, there are generally two pretrial interviewers available during the weekday operating hours. At night and on weekends there is one pretrial interviewer on duty.

In Linn County there are five part-time interviewers. During weekday and evening hours there is one interviewer on duty; on weekends there are two interviewers.

The pretrial programs find out who has been arrested by making periodic visits to the jails, or are notified by phone from the jails of an arrest (especially at night). Occasionally, a friend or relative of the defendant may inform the pretrial release office of the arrest.

The PTR interview generally lasts ten to fifteen minutes. The interviewer and the defendant are standing, with the interviewer asking questions through the bars of a holding-area cell containing the prisoners. The interviewer asks questions and records responses very quickly, occasionally asking for clarification of a response.

The information recorded by the interviewer as the interview proceeds is of the following types = a) identified information (name, aliases, social security number, age, date of birth, race, sex); b) residence information (present address, how long at present address, telephone number, living arrangements, owning or renting, prior address, how long at previous address, address if released, place of birth); c) employment history (present and past employers, job titles, length of present and past employment, other types of financial support, such as, unemployment compensation, welfare, etc.), d) criminal record (juvenile and adult records, charges and dispositions, current status in the criminal justice system, such as, probation, parole, or pending charges); e) family ties (marital status, number of children, number of dependents being supported) and f) other information (health problems, drug problems, military service, and education).

Following the interview, the interviewer contacts by phone the references given by the defendant during the interview and attempts to verify certain parts of the information listed above. In Polk County, the interviewer tries to get as many as five references from the defendant, and the pertinent information must be verified with at least one of these references. References are usually close relatives, frequently the defendant's spouse or brothers or sisters, but the names of acquaintances and/or friends are also requested. Criminal history information is further checked by looking at Des Moines Police Department rap sheets and in some cases rap sheets from the State

Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI).[1]

Pretrial interviewers in Linn County try to get three personal references and will contact the defendant's employer, if doing so will not endanger his job. As in Polk County, certain pertinent information (information that determines the number of "points" received by the defendant) must be verified with at least one reference. Criminal history information is checked by requesting local and BCI rap sheets on all individuals interviewed.

To qualify for pretrial release the defendant needs five verified points as itemized on the point system. This is essentially the same point system as introduced by the Vera-Manhattan ROR program in 1961 and which has been the model for pretrial programs throughout the nation. The ROR point system is discussed further in Chapter VI (Figure 1, page 45).

If the defendant receives five or more verified points and does not otherwise seem to be a poor risk for PTR (i.e., because he has previous charges pending, is on probation or parole, etc.), he will be recommended for PTR. In Polk County, the interviewer makes this recommendation in the judge's chambers to the judge who arraigned the defendant following the completion of arraignments. If the defendant was interviewed prior to arraignment, this recommendation may be made soon after arraignment. If the defendant was not interviewed prior to arraignment, there will be a greater lag between the arraignment and contact with the judge to recommend release. In Linn County, the recommendation for or against PTR is generally made during or before the arraignment, unless the interview and verification could not be completed prior to arraignment.

---

[1]The validity and reliability of these data were checked for this report and the results are presented in Volume II.

Approval from the judge for PTR is obtained in the form of his signature on a pretrial release bond. The defendant must also sign a release agreement, one of whose conditions is that the defendant agrees to appear for all court proceedings, or is subject to the penalty of a $5,000 fine and/or five years in the penitentiary for felony charges. A misdemeanant may be fined $1,000 or six months in the county jail.

In both Polk and Linn counties the pretrial release programs have the authority to release at night or on weekends individuals arrested for misdemeanor offenses, without obtaining approval from a judge. Individuals arrested for felony offenses must generally wait until they have been formally arraigned before they can be approved for any type of release. In Polk County, arraignments are held Saturday and Sunday mornings, and it may be possible for such individuals to be released on Saturday or Sunday mornings.

However, in Linn County, there are no weekend arraingments, but several judges have made themselves available on call. In addition, Linn County courts have given the pretrial program authority to release on their own discretion any felony arrestee whose bond does not exceed $1,000.

Once released the defendant generally has little or no contact with the pretrial release program, other than the reminders he receives from the program about court proceedings where his presence is required. The Polk and Linn County pretrial programs try to remind all releasees of court dates by letter if they know of these dates far enough in advance. If they do not know far enough in advance to notify by letter, they will notify the defendant by phone. The pretrial programs generally are able to determine the dates of the defendants' initial court appearances fairly easily; finding out about later court dates depends on receiving cooperation from county attorneys' offices and the courts in providing case scheduling information.

Defendants rejected for PTR are also considered for release with services (RWS) by the pretrial programs. Generally, those accepted for RWS have been arrested for indictable misdemeanor or felony offenses. The RWS releasee may be a defendant who is viewed as being too much of a risk for nonsupervised release, but an acceptable risk if released under supervision. Or, the defendant might be a good risk for PTR, but it is felt that the RWS program could offer useful help to him in such areas as employment, education, vocational training, family problems, or others.

The only procedural change noted in the Fifth Judicial District (Polk County) during the period of this study (January, 1974 to June, 1975), occurred during all of 1975 when Chief Judge Critelli required the PTR program to obtain release approval from District Court in cases of armed robbery and delivery of drugs. Such approval was not required during 1974 or 1976, and a consequence of this change would appear to be a more careful screening during 1975 of persons arrested for armed robbery and delivery of drugs, by both the pretrial program and the judiciary.

During this period, the only significant procedural change noted in the Sixth Judicial District (Linn County) was a change made by the County Attorney. Beginning in February or March of 1975 the Grand Jury has gradually been phased out as a means of indicating defendants. The more direct means of a "county attorney true information" is almost exclusively used now. This more direct method of adjudicating cases has cut one or two weeks out of the pretrial process, and therefore reduced the amount of time spent in a release status prior to trial.

CHAPTER II - METHODOLOGY

Several recent documents have analyzed in detail pretrial programs and the methodology of their evaluation (Mahoney, 1975; Watkins, 1975; Clarke et al, 1976; and Mullen, 1975).

The report by Mahoney (1975) distinguishes "pretrial release" programs that are able to identify "good risks", from "pretrial diversion" programs that are concerned with the delivery of social services, rehabilitation, and perhaps the dismissal of charges or the attenuation of sentences. In Iowa, these programs are generally labeled as "pretrial release" (PTR), and "release with services" (RWS) or "pretrial release with supervision" (PTS). The "pretrial release" option (PTR) is essentailly the same as the Vera-Manhattan "release on own recognizance" (ROR) program, and the terms are often used interchangeably in Iowa.

Description of Sampling

Previous evaluations of pretrial services in Des Moines (Polk County) have been reported by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (1972, 1973, 1974). In those reports, comparisons are made between pretrial releasees, persons released on cash bond, persons recommended for release but denied release by the court, persons detained in jail, and various other subgroups. The socio-demographic characteristics of these defendants are compared and related to various outcomes (the February, 1974 NCCD evaluation is a major component of a recent report by Boorkman et al, 1976).

The present study differs from these earlier evaluations in comparing sub-groups released through two different pretrial programs in two different jurisdictions.

These pretrial releasees were from Des Moines (Polk County) in the Fifth Judicial District and from Cedar Rapids (Linn County) in the Sixth Judicial District.

A number of pretrial statuses are possible alternatives for defendants in Des Moines and Cedar Rapids as follows:

a) Persons may not have enough points but be released by the court on their own recognizance. b) Persons with or without enough points may be released to another individual or organization by the court, other than the pretrial agency. c) A person may not have enough points to be recommended for release to the pretrial (PTR) program, but may be recommended for release to the "release with services" (RWS) component. d) A person may not have enough points to be recommended for the pretrial programs, but the judge assigns the defendant to the projects anyway. e) Persons may be remanded to jail by the court, for various reasons. f) A person may obtain his release on a cash bond, with or without an interview by the pretrial interviewers. g) A person may receive enough points, but the judges always are the final decision-makers and for their own reasons may decide against releasing someone.

Although it would be of interest to determine what factors enter into the decision-making of judges and pretrial interviewers in assigning defendants to any or all of these pretrial options, problems of data-collection and sample sizes, time and resources, place certain constraints on these types of comparisons. In the present study, some compromising was necessary.

Because of the larger sample size for Polk County (N=1520) compared to Linn County (N-157), a larger number of subcategorizations were possible with the Polk County cases. It was therefore possible to evaluate what <u>characteristics</u> of defendants may have been involved in the assignment of persons to the following pretrial conditions in Des Moines (Polk County)=

a) Project Pretrial Release (PTR)

b) Bail

c) Non-project ROR

d) Release With Services (RWS)

e) Jail

f) Residential Treatment = This category includes persons interviewed but who were assigned to residential programs, particularly the Fort Des Moines residential facility.

g) Other Bail = This group included persons who were interviewed by the pretrial programs but who were able to post a bail bond before being recommended for pretrial release.

The above subcategories of pretrial alternatives in Des Moines will be compared in terms of the characteristics of the defendants and their failure-to-appear in court (FTA) rates.

In comparing the Des Moines sample with the Cedar Rapids sample, because of the smaller number of persons in the Cedar Rapids program, it was only possible to compare the following three subcategories:

a) Project Pretrial Release

b) Bail

c) Non-Project Pretrial Release

The subcategories from Des Moines and Cedar Rapids will be compared according to the characteristics of the defendants, their rearrest rates for the period between the time of their initial arrest and their date of adjudication or sentencing, and their failure-to-appear-in-court (FTA) rates.

An effort was made to obtain information on all persons in the above subcategories who were males, arrested for felonies during the period of January, 1974 through June, 1975, and who were interviewed by pretrial

programs in Des Moines and Cedar Rapids.

The proportion of persons arrested and formally charged with felony offenses who were interviewed by the pretrial programs during this period was estimated for a comparison of pretrial program records and records from the District Clerk of Court. These figures are shown below:[1]

	Polk County		Linn County	
	N	Percent Interviewed	N	Percent Interviewed
Males	524	88.0%	381	78.2%
Females	97	79.4%	58	65.5%
Total	621	86.6%	439	76.5%

In Cedar Rapids, the following three reasons why individuals arrested and charged with felony offenses may not have been interviewed were given =

1) Some individuals may refuse to be interviewed.

2) Some persons post bond before a pretrial interviewer can reach them.

3) In some cases a defendant's attorney may prohibit his client from talking with a pretrial interviewer because of the nature of the charges against his client and the necessity of handling the case carefully.

In Des Moines, in addition to (1) and (2) (above), another reason given was that some persons are under "assignment" for up to 48 hours. These defendants are assigned by the police for questioning, and during this period of assignment the pretrial program does not conduct an interview.

One factor in explaining the different proportions of felony arrests interviewed by the two pretrial programs (86.6% in Polk County and 76.5% in Linn County) are the hours of operation of the program. The hours of operation of the pretrial program in Linn County are shorter than the hours

---

[1]About 50% of the felony cases disposed of in district court from July 1, 1974, to June 30, 1975 were checked with the pretrial program records.

in Polk County. In Linn County the hours are 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. seven days a week throughout the year. In Polk County the hours are 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight seven days a week during non-summer months and twenty-four hours a day during the summer. Nevertheless, since judges make the ultimate decision as to release, if program hours were lengthened, but without corresponding changes in the hours of arraingments more persons might be interviewed but not necessarily released.

The chi-square tests indicate a more significant level of differences between the two pretrial programs when comparing the proportion of males interviewed ($p<.001$) than when comparing the proportion of females interviewed ($p<.10$). Factors other than the hours of operation of the program that may apply to women more than men are perhaps to be found above in the kinds of reasons given by the pretrial programs for not interviewing some arrestees.

In an effort to ascertain the kinds of felony charges against persons who were not interviewed, samples were obtained of persons not interviewed in Polk and Linn Counties. When the charges against persons not interviewed are compared with the charges against the persons in the study population, no statistically significant differences were noted in either Polk or Linn Counties. In other words, the data do not indicate any significant exclusions from the pretrial programs because of the nature of the offense for which a person is charged.

The stated policies of the two pretrial programs regarding the persons who are not interviewed (the "excludables") differ only slightly. In Polk County, the pretrial release program does not interview juvenile offenders and persons arrested for Federal charges, simple intoxication, or failure-to-appear-in-court charges. Persons being held for other correctional agencies are interviewed, but not released without the appropriate agencies' knowledge

and approval. In addition, individuals arrested during weekdays for simple misdemeanor offenses are not interviewed unless they do not plead guilty at arraignment (most do plead guilty at arraignment).

In Linn County, individuals brought in on warrants for contempt of court or child support charges and individuals arrested and held in jail for transfer to another jurisdiction are not interviewed. As in Polk County, persons arrested during weekdays for simple misdemeanor offenses are generally not interviewed. Persons held on a parole violation, or with more than one failure to appear in court are also excluded.

In the following chapters the pretrial process will be described in terms of the time dimension between arrest and adjudication (Chapter III), the types of offenses for which arrested or rearrested (Chapter IV), the characteristics of the arrestees (Chapter V), the ROR point system (Chapter VI), and failure rates (Chapter VII). Regression analysis and discriminant analysis will then be used to analyze various relationships (Chapter VIII) and to construct risk levels similar to the principle behind the ROR point system (Chapter IX). A final chapter presents a summary and some implications of this study (Chapter X).

CHAPTER III

LENGTH OF TIME TO ADJUDICATION AND REARREST

Table 1 compares the pretrial samples in Polk and Linn Counties according to the length of time between the initial arrest and the date of adjudication, for those persons who did not get rearrested during this time. While only 37% of the cases on pretrial release (PTR) in Polk County were adjudicated during the first two months following their arrest, in Linn County, 64% of the cases were adjudicated during this time ($p<.001$).[1]

Among bailees, the cases in both counties tend to be adjudicated at a slower speed than the PTR cases, perhaps as a result of defense-attorney delaying tactics. Particularly in Linn County, 25% of the bailees were adjudicated during the first two months compared to 64% of the PTR sample ($p<.001$).

If the Linn-PTR cases are adjudicated faster than the Polk-PTR cases, an implication might be that the Linn-PTR sample might show lower rearrest rates since these persons are in the population at risk for a shorter period of time. This is probably related to the ability of the courts to process the various volumes of cases. On the other hand, if bailees are adjudicated at a slower rate than those released in PTR, this might result in higher rearrest rates among the bailees.

Rearrest rates, when controlling for the length of time between the initial arrest and the date of adjudication, will be presented below, but first, Table 2 summarizes the length of time between the initial offense and a rearrest.

---

[1]Levels of statistical significance are used throughout this report, and for those not familiar with this notation, a level of $p<.001$ means a difference or a relationship that is highly significant and could occur by chance in only 1 of 1000 cases, the weakest relationship would be $p<.10$ and this means that this could occur by chance in 10 of 100 cases.

TABLE 1 - LENGTH OF TIME TO ADJUDICATION (NO REARRESTS), BY COUNTY AND PRETRIAL CONDITION

	1 mo %	2 mo %	3 mo %	4-6 mo %	Over 6 mo %	(N)[c]
Polk-PTR[a]	13	24	29	16	18	(635)
Linn-PTR	45	19	9	25	2	(97)
Polk-Bail	8	23	30	25	14	(101)
Linn-Bail	19	6	26	36	13	(31)
Polk-Nonproj-ROR	'''[b]	'''	'''	'''	'''	(5)
Linn-Nonproj-ROR	'''	'''	'''	'''	'''	(9)

[a]Levels of statistical significance:

Polk-PTR compared to Linn-PTR =	p<.001
Polk-PTR compared to Polk-Bail =	n.s.
Polk-Bail compared to Linn-Bail =	p<.10
Linn-PTR compared to Linn-Bail =	p<.001

[b]In this and in all tables in this report, percentages and rates based on a sample of less than 10 cases are assumed too small to tabulate and only the number of cases will be shown.

[c]Excludes open cases.

TABLE 2 - PERIODS OF REARRESTS, BY TYPE OF OFFENSE AND COUNTY
(FROM TIME OF INITIAL ARREST TO DATE OF REARREST, IN PER CENT)

	1 mo	2 mo	3 mo	4-6 mo	Over 6 mo	Totals %	(N)
Polk County							
Property	31	15	13	23	18	100	(39)
Violent	22	39	0	17	22	100	(18)
Drugs	23	38	8	8	23	100	(13)
Others	21	7	29	7	36	100	(14)
Total	25%	23%	12%	17%	23%	100%	(84)
Linn County							
Property	(33)	(17)	(0)	(0)	(50)	(100)	(6)
Violent	(17)	(50)	(0)	(0)	(33)	(100)	(6)
Drugs	'''	'''	'''	'''	'''	'''	(1)
Others	'''	'''	'''	'''	'''	'''	(2)
Total	20%	47%	0	0	33%	100%	(15)
Polk-PTR							
Property	36	7	7	30	20	100	(30)
Violent	23	39	0	15	23	100	(13)
Drugs	(43)	(0)	(0)	(14)	(43)	(100)	(7)
Others	23	0	31	8	38	100	(13)
Total	31%	11%	10%	21%	27%	100%	(63)
Polk-Bail Total	6%	55%	22%	6%	11%	100%	(18)

Although there are limitations in the interpretation of the various subsamples, because of the small sample sizes, it appears that the Linn County sample tends to get rearrested earlier in the pretrial period than does the Polk County sample, (67% compared to 48% of the rearrests occurring in the first two months).

The comparisons for the Polk County sample of the type of rearrest show that there is some variation in the period of rearrests for the types of crimes For example, 31% of the property-crime arrests occur in the first month while only 21-23% of the other types of crimes occur during this time.

Rearrests[1] in this and subsequent tables were measured in two ways. Both the Polk and Linn County samples were checked with the district-court clerk's office and if a new offense occurred during the pretrial period it was counted as a rearrest, regardless of the date of arrest (which may occur after the pretrial period). If the arrest occurred during the pretrial period for an offense that occurred prior to this period, it was not counted as a rearrest.

Information on the date of the actual offense is not generally available from the other source of rearrest data, the Bureau of Criminal Investigation arrest records (rapsheets). The methodology of this study enabled us to compare these two sources of arrest or rearrest information, and Table A1 (Appendix) tabulates these comparisons for both Polk and Linn Counties. The rapsheets generally show more rearrests than the codesheet information obtained by BCE staff from the court clerk's records. Property offenses appear to be especially under reported when referring to the court clerk's office.

Under the assumption that an arrest is not recorded by either data source unless an arrest has actually been made, failure rates and rearrest rates were

---

[1] "Failure rates" in subsequent sections of this report are defined by whether a person was either rearrested or failed to appear in court, or both, during the time period between the initial arrest and the date of adjudication.

calculated from the combined data sources.

Returning to the question of rearrests when the length of time to adjudication is controlled, several tables were constructed showing various time-intervals and definitions of failure. The outcome variables used in this study were rearrests, failure to appear in court (FTA), and failure rates (which combine rearrests and FTA). Because of the small sample sizes and space limitations, only Table 3 is presented here. This table shows only the larger sample sizes when the length of time to adjudication is collapsed to 1-3 months and 4 months or more (excluding open cases).[1] The Polk County sample shows statistically significant differences when comparing the PTR subsample and the bailees, regardless of the length of time to adjudication, with the PTR-bailees about twice as likely to get rearrested. In Linn County, similar results are found.

No statistically significant differences were found in the failure rates of the Polk and Linn County samples, whether released to PTR or on bail.

Post-Adjudication Follow-Up

Another consideration in relation to recidivism was what happened to persons in the sample after their date of adjudication for the original offense? How does their criminal behavior over the long-run compare with their behavior during the pretrial period?

Table 4 summarizes the data on the proportion of people who were rearrested within one year of their initial date of adjudication. While the PTR samples in both counties show about the same proportion who were rearrested during the

---

[1]About 3-4% of the cases remained open at the time of this study's data collection.

TABLE 3

FAILURE RATES (REARRESTS OR FAILURE TO APPEAR),
WHEN CONTROLLING FOR LENGTH OF TIME TO ADJUDICATION
(SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS USING CHI-SQUARE TESTS)

	1-3 MOS.		4 MOS.OR MORE		TOTAL[a]	
	% Failed	(N)	% Failed	(N)	% Failed	(N)
Polk - PTR	6%	(437)	24%	(254)	13%	(691)
Linn - PTR	7%	(75)	29%	(28)	13%	(103)
Polk - Bail	15%	(67)	45%	(49)	28%	(116)
Linn - Bail	22%	(18)	59%	(17)	40%	(35)

Significance levels:

Polk PTR compared to Linn PTR (total) = n.s.
Polk PTR compared to Polk Bail (total) = $p<.001$
Polk Bail compared to Linn Bail (total) = n.s.
Linn PTR compared to Linn Bail (total) = $p<.01$

Polk PTR compared to Linn PTR (1-3 mos) = n.s.
Polk PTR compared to Polk Bail (1-3 mos) = $p<.05$
Polk Bail compared to Linn Bail (1-3 mos) = n.s.
Linn PTR compared to Linn Bail (1-3 mos) = n.s.

Polk PTR compared to Linn PTR (over 3 mos) = n.s.
Polk PTR compared to Polk Bail (over 3 mos) = $p<.01$
Polk Bail compared to Linn Bail (over 3 mos) = n.s.
Linn PTR compared to Linn Bail (over 3 mos) = $p<.10$

[a]Excluding open cases

TABLE 4 - REARRESTS WITHIN A YEAR FROM DATE OF ADJUDICATION
BY PRETRIAL CONDITION AND COUNTY
(RAPSHEET DATA ONLY)

	Percent Rearrested	(N)[a]
Polk-PTR	17%	(623)
Polk-Bail	30%	(98)
Polk-Nonproject-ROR	'''	(5)
Linn-PTR	16%	(103)
Linn-Bail	16%	(31)
Linn-Nonproject-ROR	36%	(11)
TOTAL	18%	(871)

[a]Excludes the following cases: 1) those who were committed to institutions after adjudication, 2) open cases as of November 1, 1976 when rapsheets were obtained from BCI, and 3) cases adjudicated after November 30, 1975, and not rearrested by November 1, 1976 (since this was less than the one-year follow-up period). Those who were in the pretrial programs more than once were counted only once.

one year follow-up (17% and 16%), bailees in Polk County were rearrested almost twice as often during the one-year follow-up as were the Linn-bailees (30% compared to 16%). For the entire population for which BCI arrest records were available, 18% had been rearrested during the one year after their adjudication for the original charge.

Table 5 represents the data for the one-year follow-up period, but in addition, any rearrest as of November 1, 1976 during this post-adjudication period was counted. The result is to increase the rearrests from 18% (during the one-year period) to 25% (regardless of length of time). The comparisons in Table 5 show a general increase since the length of time covered is varying amounts greater than one year. Bailees generally show higher rearrest rates than the PTR-releasees.

In Table 6, the data from both Tables 4 and 5 are related to whether the men had been rearrested during the pretrial period. For example, among the Polk-PTR sample, 30% of those who had been rearrested during the pretrial period, were rearrested during the one-year post-adjudication period, compared to 15% of those who had not been rearrested during the pretrial period. Among the Polk-bailees, similar trends can be noted, but with higher levels of criminal behavior than among the PTR releasees. The Polk-bail sample shows 62% of those rearrested during the pretrial period were also rearrested during the post-adjudication period, while 23% of those who had not been rearrested during the pretrial period were rearrested during the one-year follow-up period. Because of the smaller sample sizes in Linn County, it is difficult to determine if the same trends for Polk also apply to Linn County.

When correlation coefficients were calculated for these figures, the results shown in Table 7 were obtained. These correlations reveal that persons

TABLE 5 - REARRESTS FROM DATE OF ADJUDICATION TO NOVEMBER 1, 1976 (INCLUDING REARRESTS WITHIN ONE YEAR FROM DATE OF ADJUDICATION), BY PRETRIAL CONDITION AND COUNTY (RAPSHEET DATA ONLY)

	Percent Rearrested	(N)[a]
Polk-PTR	24%	(623)
Polk-Bail	36%	(98)
Polk-Nonproject-ROR	'''	(5)
Linn-PTR	21%	(103)
Linn-Bail	36%	(31)
Linn-Nonproject-ROR	36%	(11)
TOTAL	25%	(871)

[a]See footnote to Table 4.

TABLE 6 - REARRESTS AFTER ADJUDICATION, WITH REARRESTS DURING PRETRIAL PERIOD, BY PRETRIAL CONDITION AND COUNTY
(RAPSHEET DATA ONLY)

	REARRESTED AFTER ADJUDICATION			
	Within a Year		As of Nov.1, 1976	
	%	(N)[a]	%	(N)
POLK - PTR				
Rearrested During Pretrial Period	30%	(53)	38%	(53)
Not Rearrested During Pretrial Per.	15%	(570)	22%	(570)
TOTAL	17%	(623)	24%	(623)
POLK - BAIL				
Rearrested During Pretrial Period	62%	(16)	62%	(16)
Not Rearrested During Pretrial Per.	23%	(82)	30%	(82)
TOTAL	30%	(98)	36%	(98)
LINN - PTR				
Rearrested During Pretrial Period	'''[b]	(8)	'''	(8)
Not Rearrested During Pretrial Per.	13%	(95)	18%	(95)
TOTAL	16%	(103)	21%	(103)
LINN - BAIL				
Rearrested During Pretrial Period	'''	(8)	'''	(8)
Not Rearrested During Pretrial Per.	17%	(23)	30%	(23)
TOTAL	16%	(31)	36%	(31)

[a] See footnote to Table 4.
[b] Percentages and rates based on a sample of less than 10 cases are assumed too small to tabulate and only the number of cases will be shown in tables throughout this report.

TABLE 7 - CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR REARRESTS WHILE IN THE PROGRAM WITH REARRESTS AFTER ADJUDICATION

		Rearrest While In Program
POLK-PTR, Bail, Nonproj-ROR		
Rearrest After Adjudication (Within a Year)	- r	.159
	- (N)[a]	(726)
	- significance	p<.001
Rearrest After Adjudication (As of Nov.1,1976)		
	- r	.133
	- (N)	(726)
	- significance	p<.001
LINN-PTR, Bail, Nonproj-ROR		
Rearrest After Adjudication (Within a Year)	- r	.160
	- (N)	(145)
	- significance	p<.05
Rearrest After Adjudication (As of Nov. 1,1976)		
	- r	.259
	- (N)	(145)
	- significance	p<.001

[a]See footnote to Table 4.

rearrested during the pretrial period are correlated at a high level of statistical significance with the likelihood that they will be rearrested during the post-adjudication period. We can conclude that the pretrial experience for PTR releasees and bailees, in both counties, did not cause them to cease their criminal behavior during the post-adjudication period. A subsequent study of persons released with supervision (RWS) in other counties may provide data on whether these kind of remedial services have had a long-term (within one year) beneficial effect on criminal behavior.

The Appendix contains a brief Research Note dealing with the hypothesis that persons do or do not engage in careers of a particular type of offense. In the next chapter, the types of offenses for which persons were arrested or rearrested are considered.

CHAPTER IV

TYPE OF OFFENSES

In this chapter the types of offenses for which persons who were in this sample were initially arrested is discussed, as well as the type of offenses for which persons were rearrested during the pretrial period.[1]

Tables 8 and 9 are alternate ways of percentaging the same data on the type of initial offense. In addition, Table 8 indicates the differences in the total sample sizes when considering total offenses compared to total cases or individuals. In Polk County, 1520 persons committed 1756 offenses, while in Linn County 157 persons committed 173 offenses. Table 8 also shows the variations that exist among the various pretrial conditions in the types of offenses committed by the persons in those programs. For instance, the Polk-PTR sample shows that 58% of the offenses committed by persons in this program were for property offenses, and the types of offenses are almost identical with those committed by the bailees.

Chi-square tests (presented in Volume II) reveal that men in the Linn-PTR program are more likely to be arrested for property offenses than the Polk-PTR sample, while those in the Polk-PTR sample are more likely than the Linn-PTR sample to be charged with violent offenses.

Table 9 presents the data when percentaged according to the proportion of the offenses committed by persons in the various programs. When comparing the percent distribution of total offenses with the distribution of types of

---

[1]The specific offenses for which rearrests were made are included in the Appendix in Table A1. The offenses for which persons were originally arrested are presented in Table A2.

TABLE 8
TYPE OF ARRESTING OFFENSES, BY COUNTY AND PRETRIAL CONDITIONS,
(PER CENT OF OFFENSES IN VARIOUS PRETRIAL CONDITIONS)

	Property	Violent	Drugs	Others	Total %	Total Offenses(N)	Total Cases
Polk County							
PTR	58%*	27%	11%	4%	100%	(809)	(714)
RWS	48%	31%	14%	7%	100%	(296)	(261)
Nonproj. ROR	'''	'''	'''	'''	'''	(8)	(7)
Bail	57%	26%	14%	3%	100%	(145)	(119)
Jail	56%	34%	7%	3%	100%	(353)	(297)
Residential	38%	40%	7%	15%	100%	(40)	(31)
Others	49%	27%	13%	11%	100%	(105)	(91)
TOTAL Sample	55%	29%	11%	5%	100%	(1756)	(1520)
Linn County							
PTR	68%	15%	7%	10%	100%	(118)	(107)
Nonproj. ROR	77%	23%	0%	0%	100%	(13)	(13)
Bail	55%	33%	7%	5%	100%	(42)	(37)
TOTAL Sample	66%	20%	6%	8%	100%	(173)	(157)

*Percentages based on total offenses (rows)

TABLE 9 - TYPE OF ARRESTING OFFENSES, BY COUNTY AND PRETRIAL CONDITIONS, (PER CENT OF PRETRIAL CONDITIONS DEALING WITH VARIOUS OFFENSES)

	Property	Violent	Drugs	Others	Total %
Polk County					
PTR	49%[a]	42%	46%	39%	46%
RWS	8%	7%	11%	5%	8%
Nonproj. ROR	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%
Bail	15%	18%	22%	23%	17%
Jail	20%	24%	12%	12%	20%
Residential	2%	3%	2%	7%	2%
Others	5%	6%	7%	13%	6%
Total %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Sample (N)	(962)	(516)	(186)	(92)	(1756)
Linn County					
PTR	71%	51%	73%	86%	68%
Nonproj. ROR	20%	40%	27%	14%	24%
Bail	9%	9%	0%	0%	8%
Total %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Sample (N)	(113)	(35)	(11)	(14)	(173)

[a]Percentages based on Total Sample Ns. (columns)

offenses it appears that Polk-PTR accounts for 46% of the offenses committed in Polk County but is slightly over-represented by persons who committed property offenses (49%), while Linn-PTR accounts for 68% of the total offenses but includes 86% of the type of offenses categorized as "others". The offenses included in this category are tabulated in Table A2 and in both Polk and Linn Counties the most common offense is "operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol-subsequent offense" which is a felony.[1]

In Polk County, persons having committed violent offenses appear to be under-represented in the PTR program and over-represented in the sample of jailees. The persons charged with drug abuse seem to be over-represented among the bailees.

In Linn County, persons charged with drug abuse are unlikely to be released on bail and 73% were released to PTR.

In order to determine if the arrestees who were interviewed by pretrial interviewers differed from persons not interviewed in terms of the types of offenses for which they are charged, a sample of 83 cases in Polk County and a sample of 102 cases in Linn County were obtained and compared to the percentage distributions in Tables 8 and 9. No significant differences were found.

The type of offenses that are found among rearrests during the pretrial period are tabulated in Tables 10 and 11 and as in the previous tables, the same data is percentaged in two different ways. In both tables, the offenses from both data sources, court records and BCI rapsheets, are included.[2]

---

[1]While the original sample for this study was of persons arrested for a felony, the inclusion of accompanying charges results in the tabulation of indictable and simple misdemeanors.

[2]By using both data sources, the total number of rearrests in Polk County is increased from 142 (court records) to 177, and in Linn County from 18 (court records) to 39. See also Table A1 (Appendix).

TABLE 10 - TOTAL NEW OFFENSES (REARRESTS) FROM COURT RECORDS OR RAPSHEETS, BY COUNTY AND PRETRIAL CONDITIONS, (PERCENT OF OFFENSES IN VARIOUS PRETRIAL CONDITIONS)

	Property	Violent	Drugs	Others	Total	Offenses(N)
Polk County						
PTR	52% [a]	15%	14%	19%	100%	(132)
Bail	38%	20%	20%	22%	100%	(40)
Nonproj-ROR	'''	'''	'''	'''	'''	(5)
Total (PTR, Bail, Nonproj-ROR)	48%	16%	16%	20%	100%	(177)
Linn County						
PTR	57%	29%	'''	14%	100%	(14)
Bail	33%	11%	17%	39%	100%	(18)
Nonproj-ROR	'''	'''	'''	'''	'''	(7)
Total (PTR, Bail, Nonproj-ROR)	43%	26%	8%	23%	100%	(39)

[a]Percentages based on total offenses by pretrial condition (rows)

In Table 10 comparing the total percent distribution for Polk with Linn County (for PTR, bail, and nonproject-ROR) shows that the releasees in Polk County were more likely to be rearrested for property offenses (48% compared to 43%) and drug offenses (16% compared to 8%) than the Linn County sample, whereas the Linn releasees were more often rearrested for violent offenses (26% compared to 16%).

When only those released to PTR are compared, the same relationships are noted for violent offenses and drug charges in Polk and Linn Counties, but rearrests for property offenses are reversed so that Linn-PTR shows 57% of the rearrests for these charges and Polk-PTR shows 52%.

Table 11 presents the data percentaged in another way (columns) so that the proportion in the three pretrial conditions in Polk and Linn counties are shown to differ. Considering only the rearrestees during the pretrial period, in Polk County 74% were in the PTR program, while in Linn County only 36% were among the PTR releasees. The proportion released on bail in Polk County is half of that in Linn County (23% compared to 46%).

The patterns of new offenses that are committed by releasees in the various pretrial conditions can also be noted by referring to Table 11. Comparing only the property and the violent offenses with the total percent distribution in each of the counties reveals a lack of any simple generalizations that can be made that apply to both counties.

So far, the individuals who were arrested and rearrested for various offenses at various times have not been described, only the events. In the next chapter, some of their social and demographic characteristics will be summarized.

TABLE 11 - TOTAL NEW OFFENSES (REARRESTS) FROM COURT RECORDS OR RAPSHEETS, BY COUNTY AND PRETRIAL CONDITIONS, (PERCENT OF PRETRIAL CONDITIONS DEALING WITH VARIOUS TYPES OF OFFENSES)

		Property	Violent	Drugs	Others	Total %
Polk County						
PTR		80%[a]	71%	64%	71%	74%
Bail		18%	29%	29%	26%	23%
Nonproj-ROR		2%	0%	7%	3%	3%
Total (PTR, Bail, Nonproj-ROR)	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(N)	(86)	(28)	(28)	(35)	(177)
Linn County						
PTR		47%	40%	'''	'''	36%
Bail		35%	20%	'''	'''	46%
Nonproj-ROR		18%	40%	'''	'''	18%
Total (PTR, Bail, Nonproj-ROR)	%	100%	100%	'''	'''	100%
	(N)	(17)	(10)	(3)	(9)	(39)

[a]Percentages based on total offenses by type (columns)

CHAPTER V

PROFILES OF ARRESTEES

The following characteristics are tabulated (Tables 12-13) for the various samples to describe the male felons in the different pretrial components= race, age at admission, age at first arrest, type of most serious arresting offense, marital status, living arrangement, marital status combined with living arrangement, employment status, occupational level, employment combined with occupational level, education (or number of years of schooling completed), drug/alcohol connection with the present case, any history of drug/alcohol abuse, whether the man had a previous juvenile commitment, whether he had a previous adult commitment, and the number of ROR points assigned to the man during the initial pretrial interview.

Table 12 presents the profiles of arrestees in Polk County for seven pretrial components. Table 13 presents the profiles in Linn County for only three pretrial components.[1] In Polk County, blacks appear to be over-represented among the sample in jail (30% compared to 24% in the total sample and 19% in the "others" subsample, i.e., persons on bail who were interviewed but for whom no recommendation had been made by the interviewers). Other salient characteristics will be discussed as part of the regression analysis later in this report.

In Linn County (Table 13), a smaller proportion of blacks is included in the sample under study than in Polk County, but this is related to the total

---

[1]No intentional choice was made to summarize different pretrial components in the two counties; the differences are due to the availability of the data and to time constraints.

TABLE 12 - PROFILE OF MALES ARRESTED FOR FELONIES AND INTERVIEWED BY PRETRIAL PROGRAMS, POLK COUNTY, JANUARY 1974 THROUGH JUNE 1975[a]

	PTR	BAIL	ROR	NONPROJ. RWS	JAIL	RESID	OTHERS	TOTAL
Race								
White	80%	78%	71%	71%	70%	77%	81%	76%
Nonwhites	20%	22%	29%	29%	30%	23%	19%	24%
(N)	(701)	(119)	(7)	(258)	(296)	(30)	(91)	(1512)
Age at Admission								
30 or older	24%	22%	43%	22%	21%	45%	24%	23%
25-29	15%	20%	0%	19%	19%	13%	19%	17%
24 or younger	61%	58%	57%	59%	60%	42%	57%	60%
(N)	(714)	(119)	(7)	(258)	(296)	(31)	(89)	(1514)
Age at First Arrest								
30 or older	13%	4%	29%	8%	7%	19%	9%	10%
18-29	56%	54%	43%	45%	47%	49%	48%	52%
17 or younger	31%	42%	29%	47%	46%	32%	43%	38%
(N)	(706)	(116)	(7)	(252)	(276)	(31)	(84)	(1472)
Type of Most Serious Offense								
Property	60%	60%	57%	47%	57%	36%	50%	56%
Violent	29%	29%	29%	34%	37%	45%	31%	32%
Drugs	8%	10%	0%	14%	5%	3%	11%	9%
Others	3%	1%	14%	5%	1%	16%	8%	3%
(N)	(714)	(119)	(7)	(261)	(297)	(31)	(91)	(1520)
Marital Status								
Married (Curr/previous)	49%	50%	86%	46%	44%	52%	57%	48%
Single (never married)	51%	50%	14%	54%	56%	48%	43%	52%
(N)	(714)	(119)	(7)	(259)	(295)	(31)	(90)	(1515)
Living Arrangement								
Not w/parental family	67%	73%	100%	69%	72%	76%	70%	69%
With parental family	33%	27%	0%	31%	28%	24%	30%	31%
(N)	(685)	(111)	(6)	(240)	(259)	(29)	(84)	(1414)
Marital Status-Living Arrangement								
Marr. or not in par. fam.	71%	77%	100%	73%	79%	79%	80%	74%
Single & w/ par.fam.	29%	23%	0%	27%	21%	21%	20%	26%
(N)	(685)	(111)	(6)	(239)	(259)	(29)	(84)	(1413)
Employment Status								
Employed	70%	46%	71%	49%	38%	45%	53%	56%
Unemployed	30%	54%	29%	51%	62%	55%	47%	44%
(N)	(705)	(118)	(7)	(255)	(293)	(31)	(88)	(1497)
Occupational Level								
Semi-skilled or higher	63%	34%	29%	32%	26%	36%	43%	46%
Unskilled/Unemployed	37%	66%	71%	68%	74%	64%	57%	54%
(N)	(705)	(116)	(7)	(248)	(289)	(31)	(88)	(1484)

[a]Total N's vary due to incomplete information.

TABLE 12 - CONTINUED

	PTR	BAIL	ROR	NONPROJ. RWS	JAIL	RESID	OTHERS	TOTAL
Employment-Occupational Level								
Empl.& Semi-sk or higher	52%	22%	29%	23%	17%	23%	34%	36%
Others	48%	78%	71%	77%	83%	77%	66%	64%
(N)	(699)	(115)	(7)	(243)	(287)	(31)	(88)	(1470)
Education								
12 years or more	53%	52%	57%	41%	40%	45%	58%	49%
11 years or less	47%	48%	43%	59%	60%	55%	42%	51%
(N)	(710)	(118)	(7)	(254)	(291)	(31)	(85)	(1496)
Drug/Alcohol Connection w/Case								
None	85%	81%	86%	75%	89%	68%	83%	83%
With Connection	15%	19%	14%	25%	11%	32%	17%	17%
(N)	(713)	(119)	(7)	(261)	(297)	(31)	(89)	(1517)
Type of Drug/Alcohol Conn.								
None	85%	81%	86%	75%	89%	70%	83%	83%
Alcohol	5%	3%	14%	11%	4%	17%	4%	6%
Drugs	10%	16%	0%	14%	8%	13%	13%	11%
(N)	(712)	(118)	(7)	(260)	(297)	(30)	(89)	(1513)
History of Drug/Alc. Abuse								
None	93%	84%	86%	80%	85%	68%	85%	88%
With History	7%	16%	14%	20%	15%	32%	15%	12%
(N)	(713)	(119)	(7)	(258)	(295)	(31)	(88)	(1511)
Type of History of Drug/Alc.Abuse								
None	93%	84%	86%	80%	85%	68%	85%	88%
Alcohol	4%	5%	0%	14%	11%	19%	9%	8%
Durgs	3%	11%	14%	6%	4%	13%	6%	4%
(N)	(713)	(119)	(7)	(258)	(295)	(31)	(88)	(1511)
Juvenile Commitment								
None	89%	70%	83%	71%	74%	81%	78%	81%
With Juvenile Comm.	11%	30%	17%	29%	26%	19%	22%	19%
(N)	(660)	(109)	(6)	(236)	(262)	(31)	(80)	(1384)
Adult Commitment								
None	59%	32%	29%	36%	26%	36%	40%	45%
Adult Conviction Only	29%	28%	29%	32%	31%	22%	30%	30%
Jail or Prison	11%	39%	43%	32%	43%	43%	30%	25%
(N)	(711)	(117)	(7)	(249)	(281)	(31)	(88)	(1484)
ROR Points = 10 or more	42%	28%	-	-	-	-	-	37%
5-9	57%	67%	-	-	-	-	-	54%
0-4	1%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	9%
(N)	(699)	(111)						(810)

TABLE 13 - PROFILE OF MALES ARRESTED FOR FELONIES AND INTERVIEWED BY PRETRIAL PROGRAM, LINN COUNTY, JANUARY 1974 THROUGH JUNE 1975[a]

	PTR	BAIL	NONPROJECT ROR	TOTAL
Race				
White	94%	84%	77%	90%
Nonwhites	6%	16%	23%	10%
(N)	(107)	(37)	(13)	(157)
Age At Admission				
30 or older	25%	25%	15%	24%
25-29	10%	17%	23%	13%
24 or younger	65%	58%	62%	63%
(N)	(106)	(36)	(13)	(155)
Age at First Arrest				
30 or older	11%	9%	0%	9%
18-29	51%	32%	54%	47%
17 or Younger	38%	59%	46%	44%
(N)	(104)	(34)	(11)	(149)
Type of Most Serious Offense				
Property	73%	57%	77%	69%
Violent	17%	35%	23%	22%
Drugs	3%	5%	0%	3%
Others	7%	3%	0%	6%
(N)	(107)	(37)	(13)	(157)
Marital Status				
Married (Curr./previous)	53%	57%	46%	53%
Single (never married)	47%	43%	54%	47%
(N)	(106)	(37)	(13)	(156)
Living Arrangement				
Not w/parental family	64%	76%	64%	66%
With parental family	34%	24%	36%	34%
(N)	(104)	(37)	(11)	(152)
Marital Status-Living Arrangement				
Married or not in par. fam.	70%	87%	64%	74%
Single & W/parental family	30%	14%	36%	26%
(N)	(103)	(37)	(11)	(151)
Employment Status				
Employed	76%	40%	42%	64%
Unemployed	24%	60%	58%	36%
(N)	(106)	(37)	(12)	(155)
Occupational Level				
Semi-Skiller or Higher	63%	56%	42%	60%
Unskilled/Unemployed	37%	44%	58%	40%
(N)	(106)	(36)	(12)	(154)

[a]Total N's vary due to incomplete information

TABLE 13 - CONTINUED

	NONPROJECT			
	PTR	BAIL	ROR	TOTAL
Employment-Occupational Level				
Empl. & Semi-skilled or higher	56%	25%	17%	46%
Others	44%	75%	83%	54%
(N)	(105)	(36)	(12)	(153)
Education				
12 years or more	50%	50%	62%	51%
11 years or less	50%	50%	38%	49%
(N)	(106)	(36)	(13)	(155)
Drug/Alcohol Connection w/Case				
None	82%	86%	100%	85%
With Connection	18%	14%	0	15%
(N)	(107)	(37)	(13)	(157)
Type of Drug/Alcohol Connection				
None	82%	87%	100%	85%
Alcohol	13%	8%	0%	17%
Drugs	5%	5%	0%	5%
(N)	(107)	(37)	(13)	(157)
History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse				
None	79%	68%	75%	76%
With History	21%	32%	25%	24%
(N)	(107)	(37)	(12)	(156)
Type of History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse				
None	77%	70%	75%	76%
Alcohol	19%	22%	17%	19%
Drugs	4%	8%	8%	5%
(N)	(107)	(37)	(12)	(156)
Juvenile Commitment				
None	86%	87%	89%	86%
With Juvenile Commitment	14%	13%	11%	14%
(N)	(101)	(31)	(9)	(141)
Adult Commitment				
None	57%	24%	33%	47%
Adult Conviction Only	27%	27%	33%	28%
Jail or Prison	16%	49%	33%	25%
(N)	(103)	(37)	(12)	(152)
ROR Points = 10 or more	28%	6%	-	23%
5-9	67%	23%	-	56%
0-4	5%	71%	-	21%
(N)	(106)	(35)	-	(141)

ethnic composition in these counties. The proportion of black males in Polk County according to the U.S. Census (1970) is 4.2% compared to 1.2% of the males who are black in Linn County.[1]

In order to determine which variables differed in statistically significant ways, for the PTR and bail samples in Polk County compared to Linn County, chi-square tests were calculated and the corresponding levels of significance were tabulated (Table 16, Volume II). Among the PTR samples, Polk and Linn differed on the following variables: race, type of most serious offense, type of drug/alcohol abuse connected with the present case, history of drug/alcohol abuse, and ROR points. Among the bailees, they differed on the age at first arrest, occupational level, type of drug/alcohol abuse connected with the present case, history of drug/alcohol abuse, and juvenile commitment.

The next chapter relates the characteristics of the arrestees to the pretrial release point system.

---

[1]When rates per 100,000 were calculated for black males, 15-29 years of age, in the PTR sample, it was found that the rate in Polk County is 10448 per 100,000 compared to 2586 per 100,000 in Linn County. A better base for the calculation of these rates would be the number of black males in this age group who were arrested, but these figures were not available. For white males, the rates were 1783 (Polk) and 549 (Linn) per 100,000.

CHAPTER VI

PRETRIAL RELEASE POINT SYSTEM

In this chapter the point system is related to the characteristics of the persons interviewed in Polk and Linn counties, to failure rates, and other factors. This is essentially the same point system that was introduced by the Vera-Manhattan ROR program in 1961, and which has been the model for pretrial programs throughout the nation. Figure 1 summarizes the points allotted in New York City (in 1972), and in Polk and Linn counties. The main difference between the New York City point system and the Iowa programs compared in this report is the inclusion of credit for educational statuses in the New York program, but not in Polk and Linn counties.

If the defendant receives five or more verified points and does not otherwise seem to be a poor risk for PTR (i.e., because he has previous charges pending, is on probation or parole, etc.), he will be recommended for PTR.

Table 14 presents the percent distribution for three subdivisions of ROR points, by the various pretrial conditions, and only some of the main points need be mentioned. For instance, in Polk County, males arrested for felonies who have four or fewer points are only rarely released to PTR, but they may be remanded to jail, released to RWS, placed in a residential program, or will be released on bail. In Linn County, an even larger proportion of bailees have four or fewer points than in Polk County (72% compared to 59%).

In Table 15, ROR points are tabulated in conjunction with failure rates, based on rearrests combined from both data sources (court records and rapsheets) and on failures to appear in court. For the total PTR and bail samples, the

FIGURE 1 - PRETRIAL RELEASE POINT SYSTEM

	POLK	LINN	NEW YORK CITY (1972)
Residence	3= Present residence one year or more	(same)	(same)
	2= Present residence six months OR one year at present and prior address	(same)	(same)
	1= Present residence four months OR six months at present and prior address		In NYC five years or more OR six months at present and prior address
	ADD 2 points if in Fifth Judicial District for five years or more	ADD 1 point if in Linn County for ten years or more	
Family Ties	3= Lives with spouse* AND had contact** with other family members	(same)	Lives in established family home AND visits family member(s (immediate family only
	2= Lives with spouse or parents	(same)	Lives in established family home (immediate family)
	1= Lives with family person whom he gives as reference	(same)	Visits family member(s (immediate family)
	*If common-law, must have been living together for two years. **"Contact" means sees the person at least once a week.		
Employment	4=*Present job one year or more	(same)	3= present job one year or more, steadily
	3= Present job four months OR six months on present and prior job.	(same)	2= Present job four months OR six months on present and prior job
	*Deduct 1 point from first three categories if job is not steady, or if not salaried, if defendant has no investment in it.		

FIGURE 1 - CONTINUED

	POLK	LINN	NEW YORK CITY (1972)
Employment(cont.)	2= Present job one month 1= Current job OR unemployment three months or less with nine months or more on prior job OR receiving unemployment compensation or welfare OR supported by family.	(same) (same)	1= Has present job which is still available OR unemployed three months or less and nine months or more steady prior job OR receiving unemployment compensation or welfare.
Prior Criminal Record	3= No convictions 2= No convictions in last year 1= Misdemeanor conviction(s) in last year 0= One felony conviction -1= Two or more felony convictions	2= No convictions 1= No convictions in last year 0= One felony conviction OR misdemeanor conviction(s) within the past yr. (same)	2= No convictions 0= One misdemeanor conviction -1= One felony conviction OR two misdemeanor convictions -2= Two or more felony convictions OR three or more misdemeanor convictions
Education	(No credit)	(No credit)	3= Presently in school, attending regularly 2= Out of school less than six months but employed, or in training 1= Out of school three months or less, unemployed and not in training

TABLE 14 - ROR POINTS, BY COUNTY AND PRETRIAL CONDITION

Pretrial Condition	ROR POINTS* 0-4	5-9	10 or more	TOTAL (%)	(N)
Polk County					
PTR	0.5%	57.4%	42.1%	100%	(699)
Bail	58.6%	36.9%	4.5%	100%	(111)
Nonproj - ROR	57.1%	14.3%	28.6%	100%	(7)
RWS	44.7%	41.6%	13.7%	100%	(219)
Jail	71.8%	25.1%	3.1%	100%	(259)
Residential	62.1%	24.1%	13.8%	100%	(29)
Others	45.4%	39.0%	15.6%	100%	(77)
(N)	(410)	(636)	(355)		(1401)
Linn County					
PTR	4.7%	67.0%	28.3%	100%	(106)
Bail	71.5%	22.8%	5.7%	100%	(35)
Nonproj - ROR	54.5%	36.4%	9.1%	100%	(11)
(N)	(36)	(83)	(33)		(152)

*Verified points, whenever available

TABLE 15 - ROR POINTS AND FAILURE RATES
(REARRESTS FROM COURT RECORDS AND RAPSHEETS),
BY COUNTY AND PRETRIAL CONDITION

Pretrial Condition	ROR POINTS 0-4 Fail.Rate (%)	(N)	5-9 Fail.Rate (%)	(N)	10 or more Fail.Rate (%)	(N)	Signif. Level	Total Fail.Rate (%)	(N)
Polk County									
PTR	'''[a]	(4)	15%	(401)	10%	(294)	(p<.10)	13%	(699)
Bail	26%	(65)	34%	(41)	'''	(5)	(n.s.)	28%	(111)
TOTAL	26%	(69)	17%	(442)	10%	(299)	(p<.001)	15%	(810)
Linn County									
PTR	'''	(5)	13%	(71)	7%	(30)	(n.s.)	11%	(106)
Bail	40%	(25)	'''	(8)	'''	(2)	(n.s.)	40%	(35)
TOTAL	37%	(30)	15%	(79)	9%	(32)	(p<.05)	18%	(141)

[a]Cells with fewer than 10 cases are not calculated.

Polk-PTR and Linn-PTR failure rates are almost the same (13% compared to 11%), but the bailees, while showing a higher failure rate than the PTR releasees, have a lower failure rate in Polk County (28%) than in Linn County (40%).

Relating these subsamples to ROR points shows that the point system used in Polk and Linn Counties are able to differentiate those more likely to fail from those likely to succeed. In Polk County, those interviewees with 0-4 points show a failure rate of 26%, those with 5-9 points have a failure rate of 17%, and those with 10 or more points have a failure rate of 10% ($p<.001$). In Linn County, those with 0-4 points have a failure rate of 37%, those with 5-9 points have a failure rate of 15%, and those with 10 or more points have a failure rate of 9% ($p<.05$).

Table 16 relates the characteristics of the men in the pretrial programs in Polk County to the ROR points and Table 17 presents comparable data for Linn County, along with chi-square tests for statistical significance. In Polk County, Table 16 shows that 16 of the 18 variables are significantly correlated with the assignment of ROR points. In Linn County, Table 17 shows that 11 of the 18 variables are statistically significant.[1]

If the statistically significant variables tabulated in Tables 16 and 17 are compared with the point system summarized in Figure 1 it will be apparent that points are assigned on the basis of other characteristics besides those in the official point system. In Polk County, the point system awards points on the basis of the arrestee's length of time at his present residence, family ties (marital status and living arrangement), employment status, and prior

---

[1]Since statistical significance is related to the sample size the fewer number of significant variables may be related to the smaller sample size in Linn County.

TABLE 16 - PROFILE OF MALES ADMITTED TO PRETRIAL PROGRAMS, POLK COUNTY, BY ROR POINTS (N=1401)

	0-4	5-9	10 or more	Chi-square
Race				
White	74%	77%	80%	
Non-white	26%	23%	20%	
(N)	(409)	(632)	(354)	n.s.
Age at Admission				
30 or older	23%	20%	28%	
25-29	19%	15%	18%	
24 or younger	58%	65%	54%	
(N)	(407)	(635)	(354)	p<.05
Age at First Arrest				
30 or older	9%	9%	15%	
18-29	46%	51%	59%	
17 or younger	45%	40%	26%	
(N)	(384)	(625)	(352)	p<.001
Type of Most Serious Offense				
Property	54%	58%	55%	
Violent	36%	30%	32%	
Drugs	7%	9%	8%	
Others	3%	3%	5%	
(N)	(410)	(636)	(355)	p<.10
Marital Status				
Married (curr./previous)	44%	47%	56%	
Single (never married)	56%	53%	44%	
(N)	(409)	(635)	(355)	p<.01
Living Arrangement				
Not w/parental family	81%	67%	63%	
With parental family	19%	33%	37%	
(N)	(358)	(599)	(351)	p<.001
Marital Status - Living Arrangement				
Marr. or not in par.fam.	85%	73%	65%	
Single & w/par. fam.	15%	27%	35%	
(N)	(357)	(599)	(351)	p<.001
Employment Status				
Employed	36%	57%	81%	
Unemployed	64%	43%	19%	
(N)	(409)	(623)	(353)	p<.001

TABLE 16 - CONTINUED

	0-4	5-9	10 or more	Chi-Square
Occupational Level				
Semi-skilled or higher	25%	50%	67%	
Unskilled/Unemployed	75%	50%	33%	
(N)	(398)	(624)	(353)	p<.001
Employment-Occupational Level				
Employed & Semi-skilled or higher	15%	38%	60%	
Others	85%	62%	40%	
(N)	(398)	(615)	(351)	p<.001
Education				
12 years or more	43%	49%	55%	
11 years or less	57%	51%	45%	
(N)	(401)	(630)	(353)	p<.01
Drug/Alcohol Connection w/Case				
None	84%	84%	81%	
With Connection	16%	16%	19%	
(N)	(411)	(635)	(355)	n.s.
Type of Drug/Alcohol Connection				
None	84%	84%	81%	
Alcohol	6%	4%	9%	
Drugs	10%	12%	10%	
(N)	(409)	(633)	(354)	p<.05
History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse				
None	83%	89%	92%	
With History	17%	11%	8%	
(N)	(407)	(632)	(354)	p<.001
Type of History of Drug/Alc. Abuse				
None	83%	89%	92%	
Alcohol	11%	7%	7%	
Drugs	6%	4%	1%	
(N)	(407)	(632)	(354)	p<.01
Juvenile Commitment				
None	53%	60%	75%	
Juvenile Record Only	17%	21%	17%	
Juvenile Commitment	30%	19%	8%	
(N)	(358)	(586)	(333)	p<.001
Adult Commitment				
None	26%	48%	65%	
Adult Conviction Only	27%	32%	25%	
Jail or Prison	47%	20%	10%	
(N)	(391)	(632)	(352)	p<.001
Recidivism of Arresting Offense				
Low or Medium	60%	69%	81%	
Very High	40%	31%	19%	
(N)	(410)	(636)	(355)	p<.001

TABLE 17 - PROFILES OF MALES ADMITTED TO PRETRIAL PROGRAMS, LINN COUNTY, BY ROR POINTS (N=152)

	0-4	5-9	10 or more	Chi-Square
Race				
White	81%	93%	91%	
Non-white	19%	7%	9%	
(N)	(36)	(83)	(33)	n.s.
Age at Admission				
30 or older	19%	18%	43%	
25-29	19%	9%	18%	
24 or younger	62%	73%	39%	
(N)	(36)	(81)	(33)	p<.05
Age at First Arrest				
30 or older	6%	8%	19%	
18-29	31%	51%	58%	
17 or younger	63%	41%	23%	
(N)	(35)	(80)	(31)	p<.05
Type of Most Serious Offense				
Property	58%	73%	9%	
Violent	33%	17%	0%	
Drugs	6%	4%	70%	
Others	3%	6%	21%	
(N)	(36)	(83)	(33)	n.s.
Marital Status				
Married (curr/previous)	53%	43%	82%	
Single (never married)	47%	57%	18%	
(N)	(36)	(82)	(33)	p<.01
Living Arrangement				
Not with parental family	77%	58%	76%	
With parental family	23%	42%	24%	
(N)	(35)	(79)	(33)	p<.10
Marital Status-Living Arrangement				
Married or not in par.family	86%	64%	85%	
Single & with parental family	14%	36%	15%	
(N)	(35)	(78)	(33)	p<.05
Employment Status				
Employed	39%	65%	91%	
Unemployed	61%	35%	9%	
(N)	(36)	(82)	(33)	p<.001
Occupational Level				
Semi-Skilled or higher	51%	56%	82%	
Unskilled/Unemployed	49%	44%	18%	
(N)	(35)	(82)	(33)	p<.05

TABLE 17 - CONTINUED

	0-4	5-9	10 or more	Chi-Square
Employment-Occupational Level				
Empl. & Semi-Skilled, or Higher	23%	44%	76%	
Others	77%	56%	24%	
(N)	(35)	(81)	(33)	p<.001
Education				
12 years or more	54%	51%	50%	
11 years or less	46%	49%	50%	
(N)	(35)	(83)	(32)	n.s.
Drug/Alcohol Connection w/Case				
None	86%	86%	79%	
With Connection	14%	14%	21%	
(N)	(36)	(83)	(33)	n.s.
Type of Drug/Alcohol Connection				
None	86%	86%	79%	
Alcohol	8%	8%	21%	
Drugs	6%	6%	0%	
(N)	(36)	(83)	(33)	n.s.
History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse				
None	64%	77%	82%	
With History	36%	23%	18%	
(N)	(36)	(83)	(33)	n.s.
Type of History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse				
None	64%	77%	82%	
Alcohol	25%	19%	15%	
Drugs	11%	4%	3%	
(N)	(36)	(83)	(33)	n.s.
Juvenile Commitment				
None	41%	59%	80%	
Juvenile Record Only	47%	23%	17%	
Juvenile Commitment	12%	18%	3%	
(N)	(32)	(76)	(30)	p<.01
Adult Commitment				
None	22%	57%	49%	
Adult Conviction Only	28%	25%	36%	
Jail or Prison	50%	18%	15%	
(N)	(30)	(79)	(30)	p<.01
Recidivism of Arresting Offense				
Low or Medium	64%	79%	79%	
Very High	36%	21%	21%	
(N)	(36)	(83)	(33)	p<.01

criminal record. Table 16 indicates that there is a relationship between the number of ROR points and these variables, but in addition, the man's age at admission, age at first arrest, his education, abuse of drugs or alcohol, and the amount of recidivism associated with the offense for which he was arrested.

In Linn County (Table 17), in addition to the variables of the point system, other variables include the man's age at admission, age at first arrest, the amount of recidivism associated with the offense for which he was arrested, but not education or abuse of drugs or alcohol.

The relationship between individual characteristics and ROR points and failure rates will be explored further in subsequent sections of this report, particularly when regression equations are discussed. In the concluding remarks to this present section it should be pointed out that the ROR point system that Iowa and other areas have modeled after the original Vera-Manhattan project, is no longer in use in Manhattan. Since the establishment in New York City by Vera of the Pretrial Services Agency in June, 1973, statistical analyses and evaluations of the point system have resulted in a revised set of criteria for determining whether a person should be recommended for release on their own recognizance.

The present system (as of December, 1976) in use by the New York City Pretrial Services Agency relies on seven indicators. A person is recommended for release if he/she has a verified address in the area of New York City and has 3 of the following 6 indicators = 1) has a phone in his residence, 2) has lived at his current address for 2½ years or more, 3) expects someone at his arraignment (other than the complainant or an attorney), 4) lives with his/her parents or spouse, 5) is employed, in school, or in a training program, full-

time, and 6) has no felony convictions.[1]

This summary of activity in New York City and the statistical/empirical findings of the present report may suggest to pretrial administrators and staffs in Iowa ways in which their criteria for decision-making at the pretrial stage of adjudication might be modified and innovative procedures be implemented.

---

[1] Some observers of the present New York system think a larger proportion of persons than previously are prevented from being released, and that if this system were implemented in Polk County, the number of individuals released would be greatly reduced, without a corresponding decrease in the failure rate. This hypothesis requires evaluation.

CHAPTER VII

FAILURE RATES

As defined earlier, "failure" in this report includes both rearrests during the pretrial period and failure to appear in court at a scheduled time. Other definitions can be made and this one could be criticized for dealing only with rearrests and not convictions, or that failure to appear in court can be subdivided into various motivational refinements. However, without attempting to argue or defend one definition in comparison with another, the important thing to remember is the definition that is used in a particular study.

Of importance, also, as is pointed out often in this report, are the data sources from which failure is recorded. In Volume II (Table A4, Appendix) comparisons are presented of the failure rates as related to criminal history data obtained from codesheets or arrest records, and the corresponding levels of statistical significance. Of 24 pairs, 3 comparisons became significant when using arrest records, 17 pairs remained not significant, 2 became more significant, 1 became less significant, and 1 remained at the same level of significance when using codesheets compared to rapsheets.

Tables 18 & 19 present the data relating client characteristics to failure rates based on the combined data sources, i.e., rearrests as determined from either or both the court records and the BCI rapsheets. Some client variables dealing with drug abuse and criminal history were obtained from BCE codesheets as well as from BCI rapsheets, and these are shown separately. Tests of statistical significance identify those variables that are related to failure. The more frequent occurrence of significant relationships among the PTR sample than among the bail sample may be a result of the larger sample size in the PTR

sample. For the same reason, the larger sample size of the Polk County sample than in Linn County results in a larger number of statistically significant relationships in Polk County.

In Table 18 (Polk County), of 24 client variables, the PTR sample shows 14 variables that are statistically significant. In order to summarize both Table 18 and Table 19 (Linn County) in terms of the most important variables, it might be useful to list those variables that do not show statistically significant relationships to failure in any of the samples. These variables are = race, marital status, living arrangements, and whether drugs or alcohol were connected with the current case.

Whether a person had a history of drug or alcohol abuse is significantly related to failure when this information is obtained from arrest records. In Polk County, the percent of persons with a drug/alcohol abuse history as obtained from arrest records is considerably higher, for both the PTR and bail samples, than the information on the codesheets shows. For the Polk-PTR sample, the codesheets showed only 6% of the men had a history of drug or alcohol abuse while the arrest records showed 29% had a history. For the Polk-Bail group, the codesheets showed 15% with a history while the arrest records showed 50%. In Linn County the differences between these two sources of data are not quite as great, with the Linn-PTR sample showing 22% and 23% (codesheets and rapsheets, respectively). The Linn-Bail sample shows a slightly greater difference of 30% (codesheets) compared to 35% (rapsheets) of the sample having a history of drug/alcohol abuse. The reasons for these differences require more study. The codesheet information is probably less reliable since it is obtained at the time of the pretrial interview and from the defendant's self-report. The rapsheet information refers to more official recognition of drug or alcohol abuse in the form of an arrest, and is probably more accurate.

TABLE 18 - FAILURE RATES (REARRESTS FROM COURT RECORDS AND RAPSHEETS AND FTA) OF SELECTED PRETRIAL PROGRAMS POLK COUNTY, BY CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS

	PTR		BAIL	
	Failure Rate %	N	Failure Rate %	N
Race				
White	12%	(568)	29%	(93)
Non-white	15%	(143)	23%	(26)
Signif.level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Age at Admission				
30 or older	6%	(170)	35%	(26)
25-29	14%	(111)	17%	(24)
24 or younger	16%	(433)	29%	(69)
Signif. level	(p<.01)		(n.s.)	
Age at First Arrest				
30 or older	3%	(91)	'''*	'''
18-29	14%	(394)	21%	(63)
17 or younger	15%	(221)	29%	(48)
Signif. level	(p<.01)		(p<.05)	
Type of Most Serious Offense				
Property	15%	(428)	28%	(72)
Violent	10%	(210)	32%	(34)
Drugs	14%	(55)	17%	(12)
Others	0%	(21)	'''	'''
Signif. level	(p<.10)		(n.s.)	
Marital Status				
Married (curr/previous)	12%	(353)	30%	(60)
Single (never married)	15%	(361)	25%	(59)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Living Arrangement				
Not with parental family	12%	(458)	26%	(81)
With parental family	16%	(227)	33%	(30)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Marital Status - Living Arrangement				
Married or not in parental family	12%	(485)	26%	(85)
Single and with parental family	16%	(200)	35%	(26)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Employment Status				
Employed	11%	(490)	24%	(54)
Unemployed	18%	(215)	31%	(64)
Signif. level	(p<.05)		(n.s.)	

TABLE 18 - CONTINUED

	PTR		BAIL	
	Failure Rate	N	Failure Rate	N
	%		%	
Occupational Level				
Semi-Skilled or Higher	10%	(444)	18%	(39)
Unskilled/Unemployed	18%	(261)	31%	(77)
Signif. level	(p<.01)		(n.s.)	
Employment-Occupational Level				
Employed & Semi-skilled or higher	8%	(364)	24%	(25)
Others	19%	(335)	28%	(90)
Signif. level	(p<.001)		(n.s.)	
Education				
12 years or more	11%	(379)	26%	(61)
11 years or less	16%	(331)	30%	(57)
Signif. level	(p<.05)		(n.s.)	
Drug/Alcohol Connection w/Case (codesheet)				
None	14%	(607)	28%	(96)
With Connection	11%	(106)	26%	(23)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Type of Drug/Alcohol Connection (codehsheet)				
None	14%	(607)	28%	(96)
Alcohol	6%	(36)	'''	'''
Drugs	14%	(69)	32%	(19)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse (codesheet)				
None	13%	(667)	29%	(101)
With History	17%	(46)	22%	(18)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Type of History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse (codesheet)				
None	13%	(665)	29%	(100)
Alcohol	13%	(31)	'''	'''
Drugs	18%	(17)	8%	(13)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Juvenile Commitment (codesheet)				
None	12%	(456)	26%	(62)
With juvenile record only	12%	(126)	25%	(12)
With juvenile commitment	22%	(78)	31%	(35)
Signif. level	(p<.10)		(n.s.)	
Adult Commitment (codesheet)				
None	10%	(419)	26%	(38)
With Adult Conviction Only	17%	(203)	30%	(33)
Jail or Prison	18%	(89)	26%	(46)
Signif. level	(p<.05)		(n.s.)	

TABLE 18 - CONTINUED

	PTR		BAIL	
	Failure Rate %	N	Failure Rate %	N
Offense Recidivism				
Low-Medium	10%	(537)	25%	(79)
High	22%	(177)	32%	(40)
Signif. level	(p<.001)		(n.s.)	
Drug/Alcohol Connection w/Case (rapsheet)				
None	13%	(613)	28%	(98)
With connection	12%	(101)	29%	(21)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Type of Drug/Alcohol Connection (rapsheet)				
None	13%	(613)	28%	(98)
Alcohol	14%	(37)	'''	'''
Drugs	11%	(62)	38%	(16)
Both	'''	'''	'''	'''
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse (rapsheet)				
None	11%	(506)	25%	(59)
With History	19%	(208)	30%	(60)
Signif. level	(p<.01)		(n.s.)	
Type of History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse (rapsheet)				
None	11%	(506)	25%	(59)
Alcohol	20%	(96)	7%	(14)
Drugs	17%	(93)	37%	(35)
Both	21%	(19)	36%	(11)
Signif. level	(p<.05)		(n.s.)	
Juvenile Commitment (rapsheet)				
None	11%	(466)	25%	(61)
Juvenile Record Only	13%	(176)	26%	(27)
With Juvenile Commitment	27%	(64)	32%	(28)
Signif. level	(p<.01)		(n.s.)	
Adult Commitment (rapsheet)				
None	10%	(510)	26%	(57)
Adult Conviction Only	17%	(82)	14%	(14)
Jail or Prison	24%	(121)	33%	(48)
Signif. level	(p<.001)		(n.s.)	

*Cells with fewer than 10 cases are not tabulated

TABLE 19 - FAILURE RATES (REARRESTS FROM COURT RECORDS AND RAPSHEETS AND FTA) OF SELECTED PRETRIAL PROGRAMS, LINN COUNTY, BY CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS

	PTR		BAIL	
	Failure Rate %	N	Failure Rate %	N
Race				
White	12%	(100)	39%	(31)
Non-White	'''*	'''	'''	(6)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Age at Admission				
30 or older	12%	(26)	'''	(9)
25-29	9%	(11)	'''	(6)
24 or younger	13%	(69)	48%	(21)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Age at First Arrest				
30 or older	9%	(11)	'''	(3)
18-29	9%	(53)	18%	(11)
17 or younger	18%	(40)	50%	(20)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Type of Most Serious Offense				
Property	13%	(78)	43%	(21)
Violent	11%	(18)	46%	(13)
Drugs	'''	(3)	'''	(2)
Others	'''	(8)	'''	(1)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Marital Status				
Married (curr/previous)	12%	(56)	38%	(21)
Single (never married)	12%	(50)	44%	(16)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Living Arrangement				
Not with parental family	9%	(66)	46%	(28)
With parental family	18%	(38)	'''	(9)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Marital Status - Living Arrangement				
Married or not in par. fam.	10%	(72)	41%	(32)
Single and with par. fam.	19%	(31)	'''	(5)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Employment Status				
Employed	11%	(80)	53%	(15)
Unemployed	15%	(26)	32%	(22)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	

TABLE 19 - CONTINUED

	PTR Failure Rate %	PTR N	BAIL Failure Rate %	BAIL N
Occupational Level				
Semi-Skilled or Higher	9%	(67)	45%	(20)
Unskilled/Unemployed	18%	(39)	31%	(16)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Employment-Occupational Level				
Employed & Semi-skilled or higher	8%	(59)	'''	(9)
Others	17%	(46)	33%	(27)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Education				
12 years or more	11%	(53)	50%	(18)
11 years or less	13%	(53)	33%	(18)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Drug/Alcohol Connection w/Case (codesheet)				
None	14%	(88)	47%	(32)
With Connection	5%	(19)	'''	(5)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Type of Drug/Alcohol Connection (codesheet)				
None	14%	(88)	47%	(32)
Alcohol	7%	(14)	'''	(3)
Drugs	'''	(5)	'''	(2)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse (codesheet)				
None	13%	(83)	36%	(26)
With History	9%	(24)	50%	(11)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Type of History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse (codesheet)				
None	13%	(83)	36%	(26)
Alcohol	10%	(20)	'''	(8)
Drugs	'''	(4)	'''	(3)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Juvenile Commitment (codesheet)				
None	10%	(62)	21%	(14)
With Juvenile Record Only	17%	(23)	62%	(13)
With Juvenile Commitment	19%	(16)	25%	(4)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		($p<.10$)	
Adult Commitment (codesheet)				
None	14%	(59)	33%	(9)
With Adult Conviction Only	7%	(28)	40%	(10)
Jail or Prison	12%	(16)	44%	(18)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	

TABLE 19 - CONTINUED

	PTR		BAIL	
	Failure Rate %	N	Failure Rate %	N
Offense Recidivism				
Low-Medium	12%	(86)	35%	(23)
High	14%	(21)	50%	(14)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Drug/Alcohol Connection w/Case (rapsheet)				
None	12%	(97)	43%	(35)
With Connection	10%	(10)	'''	(2)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Type of Drug/Alcohol Connection (rapsheet)				
None	12%	(97)	43%	(35)
Alcohol	'''	(7)	'''	(1)
Drugs	'''	(3)	'''	(1)
Both	'''	(0)	'''	(0)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse (rapsheet)				
None	8%	(82)	42%	(24)
With history	24%	(25)	38%	(13)
Signif. level	(p<.10)		(n.s.)	
Type of History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse (rapsheet)				
None	8%	(82)	42%	(24)
Alcohol	19%	(16)	'''	(6)
Drugs	'''	(4)	'''	(5)
Both	'''	(5)	'''	(2)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	
Juvenile Commitment (rapsheet)				
None	9%	(64)	23%	(13)
Juvenile Record Only	15%	(39)	50%	(14)
With Juvenile Commitment	'''	(1)	'''	(6)
Signif. level	(p<.05)		(n.s.)	
Adult Commitment (rapsheet)				
None	10%	(72)	36%	(11)
Adult Conviction Only	13%	(23)	43%	(7)
Jail or Prison	25%	(12)	44%	(18)
Signif. level	(n.s.)		(n.s.)	

*Cells with fewer than 10 cases are not tabulated.

Even where the smaller sample sizes in Linn County do not yield large enough differences to be considered statistically significant, the failure rates tend to be very similar to those shown for Polk County (which are statistically significant). Some of the more salient variations as reflected in the Polk-PTR samples are the following: older releasees tend to have lower failure rates; men who had been first arrested at the age of 29 years or younger had higher failure rates than those whose first arrest was at the age of 30 years or older; persons arrested for property crimes or drug offenses had higher failure rates than those arrested for violent offenses; the unemployed have higher failure rates than the employed; those who were employed and had a semi-skilled or higher level of occupation had a lower failure rate than those who were unemployed and had low job skills; those men with 12 years of education or more were less likely to fail than those with less education; those arrested for offenses associated with high recidivism[1] had higher failure rates than those arrested for other offenses; men with a history of drug or alcohol abuse have higher failure rates than those without a history; those men with a prior record of a commitment to a juvenile institution have a higher failure rate than those without a juvenile commitment; and those men with a prior jail or prison commitment have the highest failure rate (24%), those with a prior adult conviction have an intermediate failure rate (17%), and those with no prior adult commitment have the lowest failure rate (10%).

In almost every comparison of the PTR sample and bailees, regardless of the variable controlled for, the bailees have a higher failure rate than the PTR releasees, and this is often double the rate of the PTR sample.

---

[1]The "high recidivism" offenses are robbery with aggravation, uttering a forged instrument, false drawing and uttering of checks, larceny of a motor vehicle, operating a motor vehicle without the consent of the owner, and breaking and entering. This variable is based on other studies conducted by the Bureau of Correctional Evaluation of the recidivism of probationers and parolees.

The next chapter will employ the statistical techniques of multivariate analysis to relate individual characteristics to various outcomes or dependent variables.

CHAPTER VIII

REGRESSION ANALYSIS

In this chapter the results of a series of stepwise regression analyses are tabulated, as well as the findings based on discriminant analysis. Regression equations are used to determine which independant variables, such as, client characteristics, can predict or are related to certain dependent variables, such as, ROR points or success/failure criteria. The strength of these relationships can then be used in the next chapter to develop a risk score and classify persons into various categories of high, medium, or low risk.[1]

In Tables 20-23 the client-characteristic codes used in the regression equations are those shown as a footnote to Table 20. Each table is divided into two parts. Part A presents the independent variables ranked according to their levels of significance in the regression equations. Part B presents the results of the use of discriminant analysis in determining the ability of the independent variables and the two sources of data[2] (codesheets and arrest records) to correctly classify the cases in the appropriate categories (such as, ROR points or success/failure).

In Table 20A, the regression equation indicates what client characteristics (the independent variable) are associated with the awarding of ROR points (The dependent variable), in Polk and Linn Counties, among the PTR, Bail, and

---

[1]Stepwise regression analysis was used in a previous BCE report in developing risk levels for probationers and parolees. See Corrections In Iowa: A System of Growth & Change, October, 1976. Some observations comparing those findings with the present report are included in the concluding chapter, Chapter X.

[2]Only the data from arrest records is presented in Volume I.

nonproject-ROR cases. The two data sources reflect the differences that can be expected when using information on the codesheets or when using information from the arrest records. For some variables, only codesheet information is appropriate, as with "living arrangements" and "employment status". This information is obtained at the time of the pretrial interview. In other instances, as with "adult commitment" or "history of drug/alochol abuse", the different sources of data will give different values to be entered into the regression equation, and this has been mentioned previously. In the case of Polk County, the significance of the variables are only slightly affected by the source of the data, but in Linn County the differences in the data sources appears to be more pronounced (perhaps related in part to the smaller sample size.)

In Polk County, there are seven client characteristics that are significantly related to the awarding of ROR points, while in Linn County, only five are statistically significant variables. Table 20A should be referred to for these variables. The client characteristics that are common to both ROR programs are "adult commitment", "living arrangement", "employment status", and "marital status" & "juvenile commitment". In addition, in Polk County, "occupational level" and "history of drug or alcohol abuse" are significant, while in Linn County, depending on the source of data, "juvenile commitment" and "age at admission" are significantly related to ROR points when using codesheet data (Volume II).

In Table 20B, discriminant analysis enables us to determine what proportion of the cases have been correctly classified according to the point system. Determining the proportion of cases correctly classified is a measure of the success of the set of independent variables used in discriminating the groups (0-4, 5-9, or 10+ ROR points). In either Polk or Linn County, the codesheet information yields a higher proportion of correctly classified cases than the arrest record data. Since at the time of the pretrial interview, the interviewer is awarding ROR points on the basis of the information on the codesheet, rather

TABLE 20A - REGRESSION EQUATION RESULTS:
ARRESTEE CHARACTERISTICS (INDEPENDENT VARIABLE) AND ROR POINTS (DEPENDENT VARIABLE), BY COUNTY, PRETRIAL CONDITION (PTR, BAIL, AND NONPROJECT-ROR), AND SOURCE OF DATA -
RANKED FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST LEVEL OF STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

	POLK RAPSHEET	LINN RAPSHEET
Adult Commitment[a]	3**	5+
Living Arrangement	1**	4+
Employment Status	2**	1**
Marital Status	4**	3*
Occupational Level	5**	(n.s.)
Juvenile Commitment	7+	2**
History of Drug/Alcohol Use	6*	(n.s.)
Arresting Offense Recidivism	(n.s.)	(n.s.)
Race	(n.s.)	(n.s.)
Age at Admission	(n.s.)	(n.s.)
Education	(n.s.)	(n.s.)

t - test signif. levels **p<.01; * p<.05; + p<.10

TABLE 20B - DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS:
Per Cent of Cases Correctly Classified, by ROR Points

		POLK RAPSHEETS (N)		LINN RAPSHEETS (N)	
ROR POINTS	10 or more	65%	(277)[b]	73%	(30)
	5-9	33%	(369)	54%	(65)
	0-4	67%	(55)	52%	(29)
	Total Cases	48%	(701)	58%	(124)

---

[a]The following categories are used in the regression analysis tables: a) "adult commitment": 0=no conviction or non-felony conviction, 1=felony conviction or prior jail or prison term; b) "living arrangement": 0=with parental family, 1=not with parental family; c) "employment status": 0=employed, 1=unemployed; d) "marital status": 0=married (now or before), 1=single (never married); e) "occupational level": 0=semi-skilled or higher, 1=none/unskilled; f) "arresting offense recidivism": 0=low/medium recidivism offenses (others), 1=very high (robbery with aggravation, uttering a forged instrument, false drawing & uttering of checks, larceny of a motor vehicle, operating a motor vehicle without the consent of the owner, and breaking and entering); g) "juvenile commitment": 0=none, 1=juvenile record only, 2=juvenile commitment, h) "age at admission": 0=30 or more, 1=25-29, 2=24 years or less; i) "history of drug or alcohol abuse": 0=no history, 1=history of drug or alcohol abuse; j) "education": 0=12 years or more, 1=11 years or less; k) "race": 0=white, 1=nonwhite.

[b]Total N's are smaller than previous tables since cases with missing data are deleted in regression analysis.

than any data on the arrest record, this statistical finding is not particularly surprising. When comparisons are made between the relationships in the Polk and Linn samples, however, certain interesting findings are apparent. Linn County interviewers appear to award points in a more statistically uniform manner with relation to client characteristics than do the Polk County interviewers, at least when comparing the total cases that were correctly classified (61% compared to 52%). With the high risk cases (scored 0-4 points), both counties perform about the same (66% correctly classified). With the low risk cases (10 or more points), Linn County appears to classify cases more correctly than Polk County (77% compared to 67%). With the intermediate range of cases (5-9 points), both Polk and Linn County interviewers are least successful in awarding ROR points, but Linn County interviewers appear to make better, or at least more reliable decisions than the Polk County counterparts(54% compared to 33%).

The pretrial interviewers appear to be better able to determine what persons belong at the extreme ends of the ROR point system than in the intermediate category of 5-9 points. Further analysis of this relationship revealed that this middle range included a heterogenous mixture of persons with a likelihood of being rearrested or failing to appear in court of from 6% to 19% of the time. The point system as presently used includes additional information on the arrestee's length of time at their present residence and data on their employment history which were not included in this analysis. This data, in combination with the data to be shown from subsequent regression equation summaries, may increase the ability of pretrial interviewers to make recommendations on this intermediate category of arrestees.

In Table 21, the same variables and methodology are used to relate individual characteristics to failure (rearrests during the pretrial period or failure to appear in court) for the Polk County sample. In this regression equation,

TABLE 21A - REGRESSION EQUATION RESULTS:
ARRESTEE CHARACTERISTICS (INDEPENDENT VARIABLE) AND FAILURE (DEPENDENT VARIABLE) BY PRETRIAL CONDITION (PTR, BAIL, AND NONPROJECT ROR), AND SOURCE OF DATA, POLK COUNTY -
RANKED FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST LEVEL OF STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

	TOTAL FAILURE Rapsheet	REARREST ONLY Rapsheet	FTA ONLY Rapsheet
Arresting Offense Recidivism [a]	2**	4**	2+
Occupational Level/Employment Status	4*	3**	1**
Adult Commitment	1**	1**	(n.s.)
Age At Admission	3*	2**	(n.s.)
Marital Status	(n.s.)	5+	(n.s.)
History of Drug/Alc. Use	5*	6+	(n.s.)

t - test significance levels ** $p<.01$; * $p<.05$; + $p<.10$

TABLE 21B - DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS:
PER CENT OF CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED, BY FAILURE VARIABLES

	TOTAL FAILURE Rapsheet (N)		REARREST ONLY Rapsheet (N)		FTA ONLY Rapsheet (N)	
Success	72%	(612)	73%	(631)	67%	(697)
Failure	61%	(110)	65%	(91)	56%	(25)
Total Cases	70%	(722)	72%	(722)	66%	(722)

[a]Coding of variables is shown as a foot note to Table 20.

the statistically significant independent variables are somewhat different, depending upon whether "total failure", "rearrests", or "failure to appear" are predicted; the relationships also depend upon the source of data.

By comparing Table 20A and 21A, it is possible to see which variables are related to ROR points and which are related to failure, in Polk County. The pretrial interviewers and the ROR system intentionally exclude any consideration of the present offense in deciding whether to recommend the pretrial release of an arrestee and consequently, "arresting offense recidivism" is a significant variable in the regression equation dealing with "failure" (Table 21A), but not related to the awarding of ROR points (Table 20A).

Another observation that can be made in comparing Tables 20A and 21A is the amount of overlap in the significance of the client characteristics in relation to the dependent variables. In both tables, the following variables are statistically significant: "adult commitment", "employment/occupational level",[1] and "history of drug or alcohol abuse".

The discriminant analysis part of Table 21B indicates the proportion of cases that were correctly classified by the variables shown in Table 21A. In almost all instances, the data from BCI arrest records provides a higher proportion of cases that are correctly classified. "Success" appears to be more likely to be correctly classified than "failure", but this may be related to the sample sizes. The relationship to "rearrests" appears to be more often correctly classified than the relationship to "failure to appear in court", particularly when using arrest-record information.

---

[1]Because of the high intercorrelation of "employment" and "occupational level" in Table 21A, these variables were combined.

Table 22 presents the same variables and methodology for Linn County. In Table 22A for the first time "race" appears as a significant variable in predicting rearrests. Another difference in comparison with Polk County is the significance of "juvenile commitment" in Linn County. These differences suggest that a different ROR point system might be appropriate for the kinds of arrestees interviewed in one pretrial program compared to those interviewed at another.

Table 22B presents the proportion of cases correctly classified, as shown by discriminant analysis. Assuming that the BCI arrest records provide more valid data than the codesheets, particularly in predicting rearrests, it appears that the Polk County releasees can be correctly classified slightly more often than the Linn County cases (72% compared to 68%). Part of this difference may be due to the larger sample size found in the Polk sample regression equation compared to the Linn sample equation.

In Table 23, a hypothetical sample was weighted in such a way as to give about equal importance to the characteristics of the smaller Linn County sample as to the Polk County sample. Doing this increased the number of client characteristics that are statistically significant in predicting rearrests, in particular. Referring to the data from arrest records, Table 23A indicates that the only variables that are not significantly related to rearrests are "age at admission" and "employment status" (although "occupational level" is the most significant variable.) Table 23B does not reveal any pronounced differences from the relationships already pointed out in the previous tables.

The utilization of these data needs to be distinguished. The significant variables for the separate Polk and Linn County samples noted in Tables 21 and 22 can be used in the same manner as the ROR point system. Certain client characteristics can be shown to be related to various outcomes, and these

TABLE 22A - REGRESSION EQUATION RESULTS:
ARRESTEE CHARACTERISTICS (INDEPENDENT VARIABLE) AND FAILURE (DEPENDENT VARIABLE), BY PRETRIAL CONDITION (PTR, BAIL, AND NONPROJECT ROR), AND SOURCE OF DATA, LINN COUNTY -
RANKED FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST LEVEL OF STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

	TOTAL FAILURE Rapsheet	REARREST ONLY Rapsheet	FTA ONLY Rapsheet
Juvenile Commitment[a]	1*	3+	(n.s.)
Hist. of Drug-Alc. Use	2+	(n.s.)	(n.s.)
Race	(n.s.)	1*	(n.s.)
Arr. Offense Recidivism	(n.s.)	2+	(n.s.)
Living Arrangement	(n.s.)	4+	(n.s.)
Age at Admission	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	(n.s.)
Adult Commitment	(n.s.)	(n.s.)	1+

t - test signif. levels = ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$ + $p < .10$

TABLE 22B - DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS:
PER CENT OF CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED, BY FAILURE VARIABLES

	TOTAL FAILURE Rapsheet	(N)	REARREST ONLY Rapsheet	(N)	FTA ONLY Rapsheet	(N)
Success	75%	(103)	69%	(110)	75%	(114)
Failure	71%	(24)	59%	(17)	62%	(13)
Total Cases	74%	(127)	68%	(127)	74%	(127)

[a]Coding of variables is shown as a footnote to Table 20.

TABLE 23A - REGRESSION EQUATION RESULTS:
ARRESTEE CHARACTERISTICS (INDEPENDENT VARIABLE) AND FAILURE (DEPENDENT VARIABLE), BY COMBINED POLK (PTR, BAIL, AND NONPROJECT ROR) AND WEIGHTED LINN-PTR (6X) AND LINN-BAIL (3X) SAMPLE -
RANKED FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST LEVEL OF STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

	TOTAL FAILURE Rapsheet	REARREST ONLY Rapsheet
Arresting Offense Recidivism [a]	4**	4**
Age at Admission	5**	(n.s.)
Juvenile Commitment	2**	2**
Adult Commitment	3**	5*
Marital Status	(n.s.)	8+
Occupational Level	(n.s.)	1**
History of Drug/Alcohol Use	1**	3**
Living Arrangement	(n.s.)	6*
Education	(n.s.)	7+
Race	(n.s.)	9+
Employment Status	(n.s.)	(n.s.)

t - test signif. levels = ** p<.01; * p<.05; + p<.10

TABLE 23B - DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS:
PER CENT OF CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED, BY FAILURE VARIABLES

	TOTAL FAILURE Rapsheet (N)	REARREST ONLY Rapsheet (N)
Success	73% (1149)	71% (1195)
Failure	62% (216)	64% (170)
Total Cases	71% (1365)	70% (1365)

[a]Coding of variables is shown as a footnote to Table 20.

characteristics may differ from one population to another.

The data in Table 23, however, can be used in comparing the different pretrial programs and their releasees in terms of the proportion of clients found in the various resk levels. These "risk levels" will be defined and discussed in the next chapter of this report.

CHAPTER IX

RISK LEVELS

In this chapter, the results of the regression equations presented in the preceding tables have been converted into "weights", similar to the ROR point system, but contrary to the ROR point system, the weights are based on statistical techniques. The basis of the ROR point system, on the other hand, as first introduced by the Vera-Manhattan project, is uncertain and may have been more intuitive.

Also in contrast to the existing ROR point system, the weights are assigned in such a way that the higher the total number of points a person is awarded, the higher the risk level in which the person would be placed. The variables shown in Table 24 are related to the client characteristics that were statistically significant in the regression equations. The only client characteristic that is found in the ROR point system that is not found in the regression equations or in Table 24 is "length of time at a particular residence". This variable was excluded from the regression equation only because it was not part of the original data collection instrument.

When weights (points) were awarded in the manner indicated by Table 24, and related to failure rates, the relationships shown on Table 25 are the result. The delineation of the range of weights that correspond to the low, medium, and high risks was made in such a way as to maximize the differences in failure rates of the risk levels.

Table 26 then describes the particular characteristics that are related to the risk levels defined for the various subsamples and the different data

TABLE 24 - LIST OF NON-SUPERFLUOUS VARIABLES AND WEIGHTS USED IN CALCULATING RISK LEVELS, BY COUNTY, PRETRIAL CONDITION, AND DATA SOURCE

	Age at[a] Admission	Race	Marital Status	Living Arr.	Empl. Status	Occup. Level	History of Drug/Alc Use	Yrs of School	Juven. Commit	Adult Commit	Offense Recidivism
I. POLK-PTR,Bail,Non proj (Rapsheet)	0 0 1 13 2 26				0 0 1 6	0 0 1 12	0 0 1 10	0 0 1 8		0 0 1 24	0 0 1 14
II. LINN-PTR,Bail,Non-proj(Rapsheet)		0 0 1 12					0 0 1 19		0 0 1 28 2 56		0 0 1 13
III. POLK-LINN Over-All[b] (Rapsheet)	0 0 1 10 2 20	0 0 1 1		0 3 1 0	0 0 1 2	0 0 1 5	0 0 1 14	0 0 1 4	0 0 1 13 2 27	0 0 1 14	0 0 1 10

[a]Coding of variables is shown as a footnote to Table 20.
[b]All variables except marital status included in calculating combined Polk-Linn risk scale.

TABLE 25 - RISK LEVELS AND FAILURE RATES, BY COUNTY, PRETRIAL CONDITIONS, AND SOURCE OF DATA

	RANGE	FAILURE RATE(%)	TOTAL %	(N)
I. Polk-PTR, Bail, Nonproject-Rapsheet				
Low Risk	0-26	5%	27	(221)
Medium Risk	27-69	16%	63	(517)
High Risk	70-100	40%	10	(80)
TOTALS		16%	100%	(818)
II. Linn-PTR, Bail, Nonproject-Rapsheet				
Low-Medium Risk	0-40	13%	73	(112)
High Risk	41-100	38%	27	(42)
TOTALS		20%	100%	(154)
III. Polk-Linn (Weighted) - Rapsheet				
Low Risk	0-24	6%	31	(278)
Medium Risk	25-44	14%	44	(408)
High Risk	45-100	32%	25	(224)
TOTALS		16%	100%	(910)

TABLE 26 - MAJOR CONFIGURATIONS FOR SPECIFIED RISK LEVEL AND PRE-TRIAL CONDITION, BY SOURCE OF DATA

A.) POLK - PTR (Risk scale calculated from data set POLK-PTR, Bail, Nonproj-ROR)

LOW RISK - Rapsheet

1. has only one of the following negative characteristics: 24 years or younger with felony adult conviction or any adult commitment, high offense recidivism, unemployed, unskilled, less than 12 years of schooling, or with history of drug or alcohol use

2. age 30 or older, no felony adult conviction nor adult commitment, with or without any other negative characteristics

3. age 25-29 years and only one other negative characteristic, unemployed or unskilled or less than 12 years of schooling or with history of drug or alcohol

HIGH RISK - Rapsheet

1. 24 years or younger, with non-felony adult conviction only, high offense recidivism, with history of drug or alcohol use and with or without any other negative characteristics

2. 24 years or younger, with felony adult conviction or any adult commitment, and at least one other negative characteristic: high offense recidivism, unemployed, unskilled, less than 12 years of schooling, with history of drug-alcohol use

B.) POLK - BAIL

LOW RISK - Rapsheet

1. none or has only one negative characteristic (listed above under A Polk-PTR/Rapsheet)

2. 25 or older, no felony adult conviction nor adult commitment, low offense recidivism and at most 2 of the other negative characteristics: unemployed, unskilled, less than 12 years of schooling or with history of drug or alcohol use

HIGH RISK - Rapsheet

1. 24 years or younger, with felony adult conviction or any adult commitment with or without any other negative characteristic

2. 24 years or younger, non-felony adult conviction only, and at least 3 of the following negative characteristics: high offense recidivism, unemployed, unskilled, less than 12 years of schooling, or with history of drug/alc.use

TABLE 26 - CONTINUED

C.) LINN - PTR (risk scale based on LINN-PTR, Bail, Nonproj)

LOW-MEDIUM RISK - Rapsheet

1. low offense recidivism with at most one negative characteristic: with juvenile record but no juvenile commitment, history of drug or alcohol use, or non-white

HIGH RISK - Rapsheet

1. with juvenile record but no juvenile commitment, and with history of drug/alcohol use, or high offense recidivism

2. with juvenile commitment and high offense recidivism

D.) LINN - BAIL

LOW-MEDIUM RISK - Rapsheet

1. no history of drug or alcohol use, with at most one of the following negative characteristics: with juvenile record but no juvenile commitment, high offense recidivism, or non-white

HIGH RISK - Rapsheet

1. with juvenile record but no juvenile commitment and high offense recidivism

2. with history of drug/alcohol use with or without any other negative characteristics

3. with juvenile commitment with or without any other negative characteristics

sources (only rapsheet data is presented in Volume I). For example, for the Polk-PTR sample and based on the rapsheet data, two types of high risk cases are defined. The first type describes a male who is 24 years or younger, a non-felony adult conviction only, high offense recidivism, with a history of drug or alcohol abuse, and with or without any other negative characteristics. Adding up the weights shown in Table 24 for such a person would identify them as a high risk releasee who, according to Table 25 would get rearrested or fail to appear in court in 40% of these cases.

Based on the definitions of the risk levels shown in Tables 24-26, the data in Table 27 summarize the proportion of the main Polk pretrial samples (PTR and bail) that were classified as low, medium, or high risk cases, using the rapsheet data (in Volume I). In addition, the proportion of cases that were "successes" (not rearrested or did not fail to appear in court) is shown (lower part of the table).[1]

It can be shown that information from the rapsheets tend to place the arrestees in the high risk category somewhat more than when using codesheet data (8% compared to 4% of the PTR releasees, and 21% compared to 19% of the bailees).

Part B of Table 27 shows the "success" rates of these samples. The most significant finding about these data is that among both the PTR sample and bailees the regression equations are able to delineate low, medium, and high risk cases. The codesheet data differentiates the bailees in a better way than

---

[1] Although previous sections of this report have referred to "failure" rates, this series of tables refers to the more positive idea of "success" rates, the implication being that even among the "high risk" cases in Table 27, for example, the majority of the cases "succeed". "Successes", in these tables are not to be confused with the "per cent of cases correctly classified", in the previous tables (based on discriminant analysis).

TABLE 27 - RISK LEVELS AND SUCCESS RATES, BY POLK COUNTY PRETRIAL CONDITIONS - RISK SCALE BASED ON PTR, BAIL, AND NONPROJECT ROR

A. PER CENT DISTRIBUTION

	Rapsheet Criminal History			
	Low Risk	Medium	High	(N)
PTR	30%	62%	8%	(697)
BAIL	12%	67%	21%	(114)

B. PER CENT SUCCESSES

	Rapsheet Criminal History			
	Low Risk	Medium	High	(N)
PTR	97%	85%	62%	
BAIL	79%	76%	58%	

the arrest record since the low and medium risk cases among the bailees have success rates of 88% and 70% when based on codesheets, and 79% and 76% when based on rapsheets.

Also, it can be pointed out that about 80% of the low-medium bailees would succeed during the pretrial period in 76% (or more) of the cases. These persons could have been released to PTR with a better chance of success than the high risk cases that were released to PTR who have success rates of 62%.

Table 28 presents the data for Linn County, but the delineation of low and medium risk cases could not be made, and therefore, these categories are collapsed. The data indicate that about 50% of the bailees have a relatively high success rate. Depending upon the data source used to distinguish the cases, 91% (codesheets) or 72% (rapsheets) of the low-medium risk cases succeeded during the pretrial period. Even the high risk PTR releasees were successful in 83% (codesheets) or 75% (rapsheets) of the cases.

In order to better compare the risk levels of the Polk County samples and the Linn County samples, the risk levels established by the weighted regression equation (Table 23) were tabulated as shown in Table 29. This provides a single set of criteria for defining low, medium, and high risk categories for the two counties and the various pretrial conditions. Part A of Table 29 presents comparable subsamples and referring to the data based on arrest records it appears that a larger proportion of the Polk-PTR cases are classified high risk than among the Linn-PTR cases (21% compared to 13%). In both PTR samples, the largest category is the medium risk group. Among the bailees, the largest category is of high risk cases (when classified according to the arrest records).

Part B of Table 29 indicates the comparable success rates for these subsamples. Although some of the comparable categories show identical or almost

TABLE 28 - RISK LEVELS AND SUCCESS RATES, BY LINN COUNTY
PRETRIAL CONDITIONS - RISK SCALE BASED ON PTR,
BAIL, AND NONPROJECT ROR DATA

A. PER CENT DISTRIBUTION

	Rapsheet Criminal History		
	Low-Medium Risk	High	(N)
PTR	81%	19%	(107)
BAIL	53%	47%	(34)
NONPROJ-ROR	54%	46%	(13)

B. PER CENT SUCCESSES

	Rapsheet Criminal History		
	Low-Medium Risk	High	(N)
PTR	91%	75%	
BAIL	72%	44%	
NONPROJ-ROR	'''	'''	

TABLE 29 - RISK LEVELS AND SUCCESS RATES, BY COUNTY AND PRETRIAL CONDITION - RISK SCALE BASED ON COMBINED POLK (PTR, BAIL, AND NONPROJECT-ROR) AND WEIGHTED LINN-PTR (6X) AND LINN-BAIL (3X) SAMPLE

A. PER CENT DISTRIBUTION

	Rapsheet Criminal History			
	Low Risk	Medium	High	(N)
POLK-PTR	33%	46%	21%	(662)
POLK-BAIL	18%	33%	49%	(106)
POLK-NONPROJ	'''	'''	'''	(6)
LINN-PTR	34%	53%	13%	(99)
LINN-BAIL	13%	35%	52%	(31)
LINN-NONPROJ	'''	'''	'''	(9)
TOTAL	30%	45%	25%	(913)

B. PER CENT SUCCESSES

	Rapsheet Criminal History		
	Low Risk	Medium	High
POLK-PTR	95%	87%	71%
POLK-BAIL	79%	77%	69%
POLK-NONPROJ	'''	'''	'''
LINN-PTR	97%	87%	62%
LINN-BAIL	'''	73%	50%
LINN-NONPROJ	'''	'''	'''

identical success rates, some of the main differences are in the high risk cases (as defined by arrest records); the Polk-PTR cases show a success rate of 71% compared to 62% in Linn County.

In general, one can say that the lowest success rates are among the high risk bailees, especially among the Linn-bailees, but even then, about 50% did not get rearrested or fail to appear in court.

Similar data is cross-tabulated by ROR points for Polk County in Table 30, and for Linn County in Table 31. (Part A is the percent distribution for PTR, Part B are the success rates for PTR, Part C is the percent distribution for bailees, and Part D are the success rates for bailees).

By definition, very few of the PTR releasees have 0-4 points, but among bailees, this is the largest category. Among the Polk-PTR cases, the number of ROR points ("5-9" compared to "10 or more") shows only a small difference in success rates (84% compared to 90%, respectively). However, a more pronounced difference is apparent when comparing the risk levels, particularly when comparing medium risk cases with a success rate of 85% compared to the high risk cases with a success rate of 55% (codesheet data) or 43% (arrest records). It appears that more than 90% of the persons released to PTR are successful 85% or more of the time.

Among the PTR-bailees, the codesheet data indicates that among the highest risk cases, that is, those classified as "high risk" and with 0-4 ROR points, 64% of these cases succeed. The comparable success rate based on arrest records is 53%. Other comparisons are difficult to make because of the small sample sizes.

This is especially a problem with Table 31 for Linn County, when the total sample size is 106 (compared to N=682 in Polk County). The difference is

TABLE 30 - RISK LEVELS AND SUCCESS RATES, BY ROR POINTS AND DATA SOURCE - POLK-PTR AND POLK-BAIL (RISK LEVELS BASED ON POLK-PTR, BAIL, AND NONPROJECT-ROR DATA)

A. POLK-PTR (Per Cent Distribution)

ROR Points	Rapsheet Criminal History: Low Risk	Medium Risk	High Risk	(N)
10 or more	38%	59%	3%	(292)
5-9	23%	66%	11%	(386)
0-4	'''	'''	'''	(4)
Total	29%	63%	8%	(682)

B. POLK-PTR (Per Cent Successes)

ROR Points	Rapsheet Criminal History: Low Risk %	(N)	Medium Risk %	(N)	High Risk %	(N)	(N) %	(N)
10 or more	97	(110)	87	(173)	'''	(9)	90	(292)
5-9	96	(90)	84	(255)	61	(41)	84	(386)
0-4	'''	(1)	'''	(0)	'''	(3)	'''	(4)
Total	97%	(201)	85%	(428)	43%	(53)	87%	(682)

C. POLK-BAIL (Per Cent Distribution)

ROR Points	Rapsheet Criminal History: Low Risk	Medium Risk	High Risk	(N)
10 or more	'''	'''	'''	(5)
5-9	11%	68%	21%	(38)
0-4	11%	65%	24%	(63)
Total	12%	65%	23%	(106)

D. POLK-BAIL (Per Cent Successes)

ROR Points	Rapsheet Criminal History: Low Risk %	(N)	Medium Risk %	(N)	High Risk %	(N)	(N) %	(N)
10 or more	'''	(2)	'''	(2)	'''	(1)	'''	(5)
5-9	'''	(4)	69	(26)	'''	(8)	66	(38)
0-4	'''	(7)	80	(41)	53	(15)	75	(63)
Total	77%	(13)	77%	(69)	58%	(24)	73	(106)

TABLE 31 - RISK LEVELS AND SUCCESS RATES, BY ROR POINTS AND DATA SOURCE - LINN-PTR AND LINN-BAIL (RISK LEVELS BASED ON LINN-PTR, BAIL AND NONPROJECT-ROR DATA)

A. LINN-PTR (Per Cent Distribution)

ROR Points	Rapsheet Criminal History: Low-Medium Risk	High Risk	(N)
10 or more	93%	7%	(30)
5-9	79%	21%	(71)
0-4	'''	'''	(5)
Total	82%	18%	(106)

B. LINN-PTR (Per Cent Successes)

ROR Points	Rapsheet Criminal History: Low-Medium Risk %	(N)	High Risk %	(N)	Total %	(N)
10 or more	96	(28)	'''	(2)	93	(30)
5-9	88	(56)	80	(15)	86	(71)
0-4	'''	(3)	'''	(2)	'''	(5)
Total	91%	(87)	74%	(19)	88%	(106)

C. LINN-BAIL (Per Cent Distribution)

ROR Points	Rapsheet Criminal History: Low-Medium Risk	High Risk	(N)
10 or more	'''	'''	(1)
5-9	'''	'''	(7)
0-4	58%	42%	(24)
Total	56%	44%	(32)

D. LINN-BAIL (Per Cent Successes)

ROR Points	Rapsheet Criminal History: Low-Medium Risk %	(N)	High Risk %	(N)	(N) %	(N)
10 or more	'''	(0)	'''	(1)	'''	(1)
5-9	'''	(4)	'''	(3)	'''	(7)
0-4	71%	(14)	50%	(10)	62%	(24)
Total	72%	(18)	43%	(14)	59%	(32)

success rates for the Linn-PTR sample based on ROR points is similar to Polk County, with about 86% of the "5-9" category being successful compared to 93% of the "10 or more" category.

Based on codesheet data, there is little differentiation in the success rates of the low-medium compared to the high risk category, but when arrest records are used, there is a better distinction. For the total sample, 91% of the low-medium were successful, compared to 74% of the high risk category. The use of arrest records for decision-making rather than codesheet information seems justified.

In Part C of Table 31, the Linn-bailees appear to include about 44% who are classified as high risks. Of these high risks, about 43% were successful (Part D). These figures indicate the approximate number of bailees who might be released to the PTR program with a specific probability of success.

CHAPTER X

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This study has employed quantitative data and statistical techniques in order to better understand the utility and validity of the ROR point system which was introduced in 1961 in New York City and adopted in Iowa in 1964.

The title of this report may be disputed by some pretrial staffs in that "decisions" are not really made at pretrial programs, only "recommendations" to judges who then decide whether to follow the recommendation to release or not release a defendant. However, the decisions that have been the subject of this study are those made or that might be made at the pretrial program as to whether a person is a "good risk", and that a recommendation ought to be made to the judge to release the defendant.

In this last chapter, some of the more significant findings are summarized and a few possible implications are mentioned.

This study presented data on males arrested for felonies and interviewed by pretrial programs in Des Moines (Polk County, Fifth Judicial District) and Cedar Rapids (Linn County, Sixth Judicial District) during January, 1974 through June, 1975. This represents 1,520 men who were arrested for 1,756 offenses in Polk County, and 157 men who were charged with 173 offenses in Linn County.

The specific pretrial programs that were compared were pretrial release (PTR), bail, and nonproject-ROR (release on own recognizance). The programs were described in terms of the characteristics of the arrestees in these various pretrial conditions, and their relationships to the ROR points awarded and their failure/success rates. "Failure rates" were defined by

whether a person was rearrested during the pretrial period and/or failed to appear in court (FTA). Regression analysis and discriminant analysis were used to analyze the data.

Since one of the basic methodological issues in criminal justice research and evaluation deals with the quality and validity of the data, one of the secondary objectives of this report has been to explore the consequences of utilizing data from various sources - Bureau of Correctional Evaluation (BCE) codesheets, court records from the district clerk of the court offices, and the Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) arrest records or rapsheets. Some discrepancies were found in the relationships derived from different data sources and it is recommended that data from BCI arrest records be used in pretrial decision-making, whenever possible.[1]

Chapter III presented data comparing the length of time between the initial arrest and the date of adjudication for various pretrial conditions in Polk and Linn Counties. In Polk County, 37% of the pretrial releasees (PTR) were adjudicated during the first two months following their arrest, compared to 64% of the Linn County releasees. "Time" is related also to rearrests and it was found that the Polk-PTR sample had a failure rate of 6% during the first three months compared to a failure rate of 15% among the Polk-bailees, while the rate for Linn-PTR was 7% compared to 22% for the Linn-bailees.

---

[1]This recommendation has been implemented in the new data system for community corrections that was designed and implemented by BCE in March, 1977. These comparisons are shown in Volume II.

Rearrests were calculated for the one-year follow-up period after the date of adjudication and while the PTR samples show about the same rearrest rates in Polk and Linn Counties (16-17%), the bailees in Polk County were much more likely to be rearrested during this time than those in Linn County (30% compared to 16%). Statistically significant correlations were found to exist between the likelihood of being rearrested during the pretrial period and the likelihood of rearrest during a one-year follow-up period after the initial adjudication.

Chapter IV dealt with the types of arrests or rearrests when the offenses are subdivided into four categories: property offenses, violent offenses, drug-related charges, and a residual category of "others". In Polk County, among the persons released to PTR, 58% were arrested for property crimes. In Linn County, the PTR sample included 68% of the arrestees charged with property offenses.

The individual characteristics of the arrestees in these samples are tabulated in Chapter V. Among the PTR samples, Polk and Linn differed significantly on the following variables = race, type of most serious offense, type of drug/alcohol abuse connected with the present case, history of drug/alcohol abuse, and ROR points. Among the bailees they differed on the age at first arrest, occupational level, type of drug/alcohol abuse connected with the present case, history of drug/alcohol abuse, and juvenile commitment.

Chapter VI examined the criteria that are employed in the pretrial point system in three jurisdictions - the Fifth and Sixth Judicial District in Iowa, and in the City of New York (the originators of the point system). The total number of points were cross-tabulated with failure rates and it

was shown that the point system correlates with failure rates for the total Polk and Linn samples.

In Polk County, variables that are significantly correlated with ROR points include variables other than specified by the point system (which is based on residence, family ties, employment status, and prior criminal record). In addition, points are correlated with a man's age at the time of the pretrial interview, age at first arrest, education, abuse of drugs or alcohol, and the amount of recidivism associated with the offense for which he was arrested.

In Linn County, in addition to the variables of the point system, other variables include the men's age at the time of the interview, age at first arrest, the amount of recidivism associated with the offense for which he was arrested, but not education or drugs/alcohol abuse.

The fact that additional variables have been intentionally, or unintentionally been included in the awarding of ROR points opens the way for the modification and evaluation of other possible point systems. The City of New York has not felt wedded to the original Vera-Manhattan point system, and there is no reason that the pretrial programs in the eight judicial districts of Iowa should necessarily and permanently rely on the past point systems. The regression analyses utilized in the present study suggest better ways and more effective variables that can be correlated with various outcomes.

Chapter VII presents failure rates that are correlated with client characteristics. Of 24 client characteristics, the following do not appear to be correlated with failure: race, marital status, living arrangements, and whether drugs or alcohol were connected with the current case. In

summary, the following salient variations were noted: older releasees tend to have lower failure rates; men who had been first arrested at the age of 29 years or younger had higher failure rates than those whose first arrest was at the age of 30 years or older; persons arrested for property crimes or drug offenses had higher failure rates than those arrested for violent offenses; the unemployed have higher failure rates than the employed; those who were employed and had a semi-skilled or higher level of occupation had a lower failure rate than those who were unemployed and had low job skills; those men with 12 years of education or more were less likely to fail than those with less education; those arrested for offenses associated with high recidivism had higher failure rates than those arrested for other offenses; men with a history of drug or alcohol abuse have higher failure rates than those without a history; those men with a prior record of a commitment to a juvenile institution have a higher failure rate than those without a juvenile commitment; and those men with a prior jail or prison commitment have the highest failure rate (24%), those with a prior adult conviction have an intermediate failure rate (17%), and those with no prior adult commitment have the lowest failure rate (10%).

In almost every comparison of the PTR sample and bailees, regardless of the variable controlled for, the bailees have a higher failure rate than the PTR releasees and this is often double the rate of the PTR sample. In other words, while the pretrial release programs and point system were designed to enable the poor defendants who cannot afford cash bail bonds to obtain their release, the end result has been that the safe, or "good risk" defendants may be released without posting a cash bond while the poorer-risk defendants are still able to obtain their release by posting a cash bail bond. In

terms of justice and economics, the system may be said to be effective, but in terms or rearrests during the pretrial period and community safety, the system might examine ways to better identify the defendants who pose a risk to the community and to deal with their potential for continued criminal behavior.

Regression analysis is the statistical tool employed in Chapter VIII that correlates arrestee characteristics and various outcomes, such as ROR points and success/failure.

The characteristics that are associated with the awarding of pretrial release points for the samples from Polk and Linn counties are the following: "adult commitment", "living arrangement", "employment status", & "marital status". Although not included in the regression equations the defendant's "length of time at the present residence" is part of the point system, and by definition, is a factor in awarding points. This variable will be included in future studies of pretrial release programs.

Discriminant analysis is employed in Chapter VIII to determine the proportion of cases that are correctly classified. In these series of tabulations two sources of data were compared: BCE codesheets & BCI arrest records.

Analyses revealed that pretrial interviewers are better able to assign defendants to the extreme ends of the point system ("0-4" and "10 or more" points) than they are able to determine which persons belong in the intermediate range of points ("5-9" points). The variables found to be significantly related to success/failure would appear to provide an opportunity for pretrial programs to experiment with the awarding of points on the basis of other information not included in the present point system. In Polk County, the

arrestee characteristics that are correlated with failure are "arresting offense recidivism", "occupational level/employment status", "adult commitment" (that is, whether a person had a prior felony conviction, jail or prison term), "age at admission" (at time of the pretrial interview), and a "history of drug/alcohol abuse".

Pretrial programs decline to include the type of offense for which the person has been arrested in the point system, as a matter of policy. However, in Polk County, the type of offense is strongly correlated with failure, and in Linn County, the type of offense is strongly correlated with rearrests during the pretrial period. Data in Chapter III (Table 7) reveal that rearrests during the pretrial period are, in turn, strongly correlated with rearrests during the one-year follow-up period after their initial adjudication.

Chapter IX summarizes the information obtained from the regression analysis and transformed into "risk levels". The "weights" arrived at are the equivalent of the ROR "points". Decisions and recommendations at the pretrial stage would seem to be capable of being made with greater precision and effectiveness when based on the "weights" derived from statistical analysis than when continuing to use the traditional point system. This conclusion could be evaluated further if an innovative pretrial administrator were to implement these findings.

Some comparisons were made between the data obtained in this pretrial study with the data presented in a previous report from BCE entitled, "Corrections in Iowa: A System of Growth and Change". The latter report and subsequent data-analyses use essentially the same statistical techniques, but for post-conviction cases, that is, probationers and parolees. These comparisons reveal that generally the same variables identify failure or

success among the pretrial releasees studied in the present report, and the probationers and parolees. These variables are: prior juvenile commitment, prior adult jail or prison terms, a history of drug or alcohol abuse, the type of offense for which a person was arrested or convicted, level of education, occupational level or employment history, and the individual's age.

This finding supports the validity of the data utilized in both reports, although the samples studies were different (but not mutually exclusive).

More importantly, these comparisons in conjunction with the correlation between the rearrest data during the pretrial period and the one-year follow-up, suggest an interesting hypothesis that requires further research. It appears from this data that the same type of person who engages in criminal behavior during the pretrial period tends to engage in criminal behavior at a later stage in his career. The crucial question is what persons succeed, and why do persons with similar characteristics succeed while others fail? Not all potentially relevant variables have been included in the statistical analyses of the pretrial or the post-conviction samples, and further research is needed to determine what additional variables that are not presently collected may be significant factors in predicting success or failure. Such factors may be concerned with the characteristics of the criminal justice system, the type of counselor or probation/parole officer, or characteristics of the social system, rather than characteristics of the offender or deviant.

This is the first of what could be a series of empirical studies of pre-trial programs. A second study which will analyze similar data from four other judicial districts and counties in Iowa is now underway. Information on the "release with supervision" (RWS) program will be collected in the

next study, in addition to some additional information collected at the time of the pretrial interview.

Broader issues that apply to pretrial programs have been excluded from this analysis, and those administrators and decision-makers who expect that "every question you've always wanted to ask about pretrial release" has been answered, will be disappointed.

Examples of additional questions that have been raised are the following: Is pretrial release reaching everyone it should? This question was only briefly touched upon in Chapter II in presenting data as to the estimated proportion of cases that were interviewed at the pretrial programs. Related to this broad question is the data on risk levels found in Chapter IX where the possibility that persons presently in jail or on bail might be safely released on their own recognizance or on pretrial release (PTR) was discussed.

Other questions asked are: Can pretrial release change any life styles? Is there any long-term effect on criminal behavior by pretrial release (PTR) and release with supervision (RWS)? Data was presented in Chapter III that relates criminal behavior during the pretrial period to criminal behavior by the same people during the one-year follow-up period after the original date of adjudication. This study has shown that there is a high correlation in criminal behavior between these two periods for the PTR releasees and for the bailees. Whether there is any change in criminal life styles as a result of a person's experience in RWS was not dealt with in this report, but future studies will include data on RWS releasees.

Because of the relatively short history of the Bureau of Correctional Evaluation and the community corrections programs in Iowa, data that can answer questions regarding "long-term effects" have not been collected or

do not exist. Only future studies will be able to answer questions about the long-term effects of some pretrial programs. Where a pretrial program has been in operation for as long as the Des Moines program (since 1964), studies can and should be done to answer questions regarding long-term effects.

The question has been asked: Should pretrial release be terminated as a failure? Nothing in this report should be seen as a negative judgment on the concept of pretrial release. In terms of the way in which "failure" has been defined in this report, that is, "rearrests" and/or "failure to appear in court", pretrial releasees are more successful than bailees. In terms of changing life styles, however, it remains to be empirically determined what kinds of pretrial release are successful with what kinds of arrestees and for what lengths of follow-up periods.

In conclusion, in a recent article by Daniel Glaser (1975) titled, "Achieving Better Questions = a Half Century's Progress in Correctional Research", he points out some of the issues facing correctional researchers and administrators. According to Glaser, the principle contribution of 50 years of correctional research has been not in providing answers to questions but in "its guidance to more fruitful questions."

Bibliography

Angel, Arthur R., Green, Eric D., Kaufman, Henry R., and Van Loon, Eric E. "Preventive Detention: An Empirical Analysis". Harvard Civil Liberties Law Review, 6 (2), March, 1971.

Boorkman, David; Fazio, Ernest J., Jr,; Day, Noel; and Weinstein, David. "An Exemplary Project = Community-Based Corrections in Des Moines". Urban and Rural Systems Associates, 1976.

Boudouris, James, "Criminality and Addiction", International Journal of The Addictions, 11 (6), 1976, 951-966.

Bynum, Timothy; and Massey, Charles. "The Implementation of Community-Based Corrections: An Exploration of Competing Goals of Equality and Efficiency". Tallahassee, Florida = Florida State University, School of Criminology. Presented at the 1976 meeting of the American Society of Criminology.

City of New York. "Pretrial Services Agency - Report on June, 1974 to November, 1975". New York: 1976.

Clarke, S.H.; Freeman, J.L.; and Koch, G.G.. "The Effectiveness of Bail Systems - An Analysis of Failure to Appear in Court and Rearrest While on Bail". Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Institute of Government, 1976.

Glaser, Daniel. "Achieving Better Questions: A Half Century's Progress in Correctional Research". Federal Probation, Volume 39, Number 3, Pages 3-9, September 1975.

Iowa Bureau of Correctional Evaluation: "Corrections In Iowa: A System of Growth and Change". October, 1976.

Mahoney, Barry. "An Evaluation of Policy Related Research on the Effectiveness of Pretrial Release Programs". Denver: National Center for State Courts, October, 1975.

Mullen, Joan. "Monograph = The Delemma of Diversion - Research Materials on Adult Pretrial Intervention Programs". Abt Associates, 1975.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency. "Pretrial Release to Supportive Services of 'High Risk' Defendants". Report #2, February, 1972.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency. "Pretrial Release With Supportive Services of 'High Risk' Defendants". Report #3, May, 1973.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency. "Community-Based Alternatives to Traditional Corrections". February, 1974.

O'Rourke, Thomas P. and Salem, Richard G. "A Comparative Analysis of Pretrial Release Procedures". Crime and Delinquency, 14 (4), 1968, 367-73.

Roesch, Ronald. "Predicting the Effects of Pretrial Intervention Programs on Jail Populations = A Method for Planning and Decision-Making". Federal Probation, XXXX(4), 1976, 32-36.

Watkins, Ann M. Cost Analysis of Correctional Standards = Pretrial Diversion. Correctional Economics Center, October, 1975.

APPENDIX

TABLE A1 - NEW OFFENSES COMMITTED BY PRE-TRIAL CONVICTION: COMPARISON OF COURT RECORDS AND RAPSHEET DATA

NEW OFFENSES COMMITTED	POLK CT*	POLK RAP*	LINN CT*	LINN RAP*
ROPERTY OFFENSES				
elony				
Operating Motor Vehicle Without Owner's Consent	1	1	0	0
Breaking & Entering Offenses (B & E)	9	10	1	2
Burglary With Aggravation	0	1	0	0
Burglary Without Aggravation	2	3	0	0
Embezzlement, All Other Offenses	1	0	0	0
False Drawing and Uttering of Checks Over $20	1	5	1	0
False Pretenses	1	1	0	0
Forgery	3	5	0	1
Larceny Over $20	6	10	1	1
Larceny in Daytime Over $20	1	1	0	0
Larceny in Nighttime Over $20	0	1	0	1
Larceny of Motor Vehicle	1	1	1	2
Larceny From Person	1	0	0	0
Other Larcenies	0	0	0	1
Malicious Damage to Buildings	4	4	1	0
Other Malicious Mischief	0	3	0	0
Receiving & Concealing Stolen Property Over $20	6	8	1	1
Shoplifting Over $20	1	1	0	1
Uttering a Forged Instrument	7	5	1	2
Other Felony Offenses Against Property	1	3	0	0
Indictable Misdemeanor				
Trespass (Criminal); Damage Over $100	0	0	0	1
Simple Misdemeanor				
Defrauding an Inkeeper	0	1	0	0
Larceny Under $20	0	2	0	0
Receiving & Concealing Stolen Property Under $20	0	1	0	1
	46	67	7	14
VIOLENT OFFENSES				
Felony				
Assault With Intent to Inflict Great Bodily Harm	8	5	0	0
Assault With Intent to Murder	0	0	0	1
Murder - 1st Degree	0	1	0	0
Robbery With Aggravation	6	3	1	2
Robbery Without Aggravation	1	2	3	1
Assault With Intent to Rape	1	1	0	0
Rape	1	1	0	0
Carrying Concealed Weapon (CCW)	2	6	2	3
Going Armed With Intent	1	1	0	0
Simple Misdemeanor				
Assault & Battery (A & B)	0	1	0	0
	20	21	6	7

* CT= Court Records
*RAP = Rapsheet

TABLE A1 - (CONTINUED)

NEW OFFENSES COMMITTED	POLK CT *	POLK RAP *	LINN CT *	LINN RAP *
III. DRUG OFFENSES				
Felony				
Delivery or Possession With Intent to Deliver Schedule I, II, or III Substances	4	7	0	0
Drugs, All Other Felonies	0	0	0	0
Indictable Misdemeanor				
Delivery or Possession With Intent to Deliver Schedule IV, or V Substances	1	2	0	0
Possession of Controlled Substances	13	14	1	2
	18	23	1	2
IV. OTHER OFFENSES				
Felony				
Interfering With Administration of Justice	1	1	0	0
Other Felony Offenses Against Public Justice & Auth.	1	1	2	0
Sodomy	1	2	0	0
Operating Motor Vehicle While Under Influence-Subsequent Offenses	0	5	0	1
Conspiracy	0	1	0	0
Other Miscellaneous Felony Offenses	4	1	2	0
Indictable Misdemeanor				
Other Indictable Misdemeanor Offenses Against Public Health, Peace & Safety	0	1	0	0
Extortion	0	1	0	0
Indecent Exposure	0	2	0	0
Operating Motor Vehicle While Under Influence(1st Off.)	8	3	0	0
Other Indictable Misdemeanors Involving Motor Vehicle Offenses	5	0	0	0
Contributing to Delinquency of Minor	0	0	0	1
Simple Misdemeanor				
Disturbing Peace and Quiet (DPQ)	0	2	0	0
Intoxication	0	7	0	0
Simulated Intoxication	0	1	0	0
Other Simple Misdemeanor Offenses Against Public Health, Peace & Safety	0	1	0	1
Driving While License Revoked or Suspended	0	1	0	0
Other Simple Misdemeanors Involving Motor Vehicle Offenses	0	1	0	0
	20	31	4	3
	N=104	142	N=18	26

* CT = Court Records
*RAP = Rapsheet

TABLE A2 - LIST OF ARRESTING OFFENSES

I. PROPERTY OFFENSES = possession of burglary tools, operating motor vehicle without owner's consent, arson, breaking & entering offenses (B & E), burglary with aggravation, burglary without aggravation, embezzlement of secured interest in collateral over $20, embezzlement-all other offenses, false drawing and uttering of checks over $20, false pretenses, forgery, larceny over $20, larceny in daytime over $20, larceny in nighttime over $20, larceny of motor vehicle, larceny from person, other larcenies, malicious damage to buildings, other malicious mischief, receiving & concealing stolen property over $20, shoplifting over $20, uttering a forged instrument other felony offenses against property, larceny in daytime under $20, larceny in nighttime under $20, other malicious mischief, trespass (criminal); damage over $200, defrauding an innkeeper, larceny under $20, receiving & concealing stolen property under $20, shoplifting under $20, trespass (criminal); damage under $100.

II. VIOLENT OFFENSES = assault with intent to inflict great bodily harm, assault with intent to murder, assault with intent to commit other felonies, malicious threats, manslaughter, mayhem (maiming), murder-1st degree, robbery with aggravation, robbery without aggravation, other non-sex felony offenses against persons, assault & battery (A & B), pointing gun at another, assault with intent to rape, rape, other sex-related felonies, carrying concealed weapon (CCW), going armed with intent, lascivious acts with child.

III. DRUG OFFENSES = delivery or possession with intent to deliver schedule I, II, or III substances, drugs-all other felonies, delivery or possession with intent to deliver schedule IV or V substances, possession of controlled substances.

IV. OTHER OFFENSES = other felony offenses against public health, peace & safety, other indictable misdemeanor offenses against public health, peace and safety, consuming beer on public street or highway, disturbing peace and quiet (DPQ), intoxication, other simple misdemeanor offenses against public health, peace and safety, compounding a felony punishable by life imprisonment, escape, interfering with administration of justice, resisting arrest, enticing females into prostitution, solicitation for prostitution, sodomy, other indictable misdemeanor offenses against public morals, operating motor vehicle while under influence-subsequent offenses, other felonies involving motor vehicle offenses, failure to render assistance to injured, operating motor vehicle while under influence (1st offense), driving while license revoked or suspended, other simple misdemeanors involving motor vehicle offenses, child stealing, contributing to delinquency of minor, conspiracy, other miscellaneous felony offenses.

APPENDIX

Research Note - Careers in Crime

The criminological literature includes studies of the hypothesis that persons may or may not pursue careers in a particular type of crime, such as, violent offenders, or drug addicts, and so forth. In order to examine this hypothesis with the data available from the present study, in only a brief way, Table A3 was prepared.

The data in this table refer to the arrestees who at three different time periods were rearrested for four types of crime (see Tables A1 and A2 for the specific offenses included under these types). The three time periods were: the time of the initial offense, the pretrial period, that is, between the time of the original offense, and the date of adjudication of that initial offense; and the one-year or more follow-up period after the initial date of adjudication.

The numbers on the left side of Table A3 refer to various career patterns. In other words, persons may have been arrested during any two of the time periods for only violent offenses. Or a person may have been arrested during three time periods, on one occasion for a violent offense and on the other two occasions for two separate property offenses.

Persons who were arrested on two or three occasions for only one type of offense would be considered persons who were following a particular criminal career; that is, their careers are homogeneous as to the type of offenses they were arrested for during the periods for which the data was collected.

Table A3 - Careers in Crime[a]

Type of Crime Pattern				Pretrial Conditions								Totals	
Violent	Property	Drugs	Others	Polk-PTR N	Polk-PTR %	Polk-Bail N	Polk-Bail %	Linn-PTR N	Linn-PTR %	Linn-Bail N	Linn-Bail %	N	%
2				18	10.0	9	22.0	1	4.0	2	13.3	30	11.5
3				2	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.8
	2			64	35.6	14	34.1	12	48.0	6	40.0	96	36.8
	3			9	5.0	5	12.2	1	4.0	2	13.3	17	6.5
		2		11	6.1	2	4.9	2	8.0	0	0.0	15	5.7
		3		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
			2	3	1.7	0	0.0	3	12.0	0	0.0	6	2.3
			3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.0	0	0.0	1	0.4
2	1			3	1.7	3	7.3	1	4.0	2	13.3	9	3.4
2		1		0	0.0	2	4.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.8
2			1	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.4
1	2			3	1.7	3	7.3	2	8.0	2	13.3	10	3.8
	2	1		2	1.1	3	7.3	0	0.0	1	6.7	6	2.3
	2		1	1	0.6	2	4.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.1
1		2		0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	1	2		1	0.6	1	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.8
		2	1	3	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.1
Total Recidivisits				180	29%	41	42%	25	24%	15	48%	261	31%
Total Non-recidivists				443	71%	57	58%	78	76%	16	52%	594	69%
Total Cases (Arrestees)				623	100%	98	100%	103	100%	31	100%	855	100%

[a]Percentages are based on the total number of recidivists.

The percentages in Table A3 do not total to 100% because of the way the offenses were counted. Persons may have been arrested for more than one type of offense on the same occasion. The totals at the bottom of the table do indicate, however, the proportion of arrestees who can be considered "recidivists". The proportions in the PTR and bail samples in both Polk and Linn counties who are recidivists are rather similar. The pretrial releasees (PTR) in Polk County were rearrested 29% of the time while in Linn County 24% were rearrested. Among the bailees 42% in Polk County and 48% in Linn County can be considered recidivists. This can be explained in part by the pretrial program policies whereby if a person had been released to PTR on a previous occasion he would be considered a high risk if rearrested, and therefore, would not be recommended for release to PTR but instead would be required to post a cash bond.

If "careerists" are defined as persons who were rearrested on two or three occasions for the same type of crime, Table A3 shows that 59.5% of the Polk-PTR arrestees were arrested for the same type of crime, 73.2% of the Polk-bailees, 80% of the Linn-PTR sample, and 66.6% of the Linn-bailees. In all samples, the persons who committed only property offenses were the predominant category, with 40.6% of the Polk-PTR releasees who might be labelled "property offenders", 46.3% of the Polk-bailees, 52.0% of the Linn-PTR releasees, and 53.3% of the Linn-bailees who could be considered this kind of careerist.

Other patterns that are suggested by the findings in Table A5 and which require additional study of criminal careers are the following: the combination of violent offenses and property offenses appear to be more common than the combination of violent and drug offenses (this has also been noted in Boudouris, 1976); property crimes combined with violent offenses appear to be more frequent

than property crimes combined with drug offenses, at least over the brief careers noted in this study.

This research is meant to be heuristic and further study is needed of the hypothesis. Rather than considering only three points in a person's life, a more longitudinal study would be useful. With the data system that has recently been implemented by BCE, ongoing studies of the corrections system and the careers of persons going through the system will be possible in the future.